/237.032E56>C1>V4/

49916
England

St. Procopius College Library
Lisle, Illinois

The books in the reference section are to be used only in the library.

Books reserved for the use of certain classes are to be used in the library during class hours. By special arrangement they may be used outside the library after class hours.

All other books may be retained for two weeks and renewed once for the same period.

One cent a day is charged for each book kept overdue.

Damage to books beyond reasonable wear and all losses shall be paid for.

No books may be taken from the library without being charged.

Complete regulations may be found in the Library Handbook, which every student is urged to consult for full use of the library.

WORKS OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN ENGLAND

FIRST BISHOP OF CHARLESTON

Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index
under the direction of

THE MOST REVEREND SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER
Archbishop of Milwaukee

With Portraits

VOLUME IV

WITHDRAWN

Cleveland, Ohio
The Arthur H. Clark Company
1908

COPYRIGHT 1908, BY

THE ARTHUR H. CLARK COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

49911

CONTENTS OF VOLUME IV

PART III. HISTORY: GENERAL [CONCLUDED].

History and Doctrine of the Waldenses 9

The Roman Chancery 28

PART III. HISTORY: ECCLESIASTICAL.

Bull of the Crusades and Catholicity in South America 195

Propagation of the Faith in the United States 256

The Early History of the Diocese of Charleston 298

Mother Mary Charles Molony 328

PART III. HISTORY: HISTORICAL FRAGMENTS.

Denmark 342

Sweden 347

Norway 354

Russia 358

European Turkey 371

The Greek Schism 399

PART IV. ESSAYS.

The Republic in Danger 411

PART III

HISTORY

(*Concluded from Volume III*)

HISTORY AND DOCTRINE OF THE WALDENSES

[The ensuing controversy with the *Charleston Observer*, is found in Vols. XVI and XVII of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*.]

SECTION I

We have found the following article in the *Charleston Observer*, of last Saturday:—

AN OLD CONFESSION OF FAITH.

"'Where was your religion before Luther?' is a standing interrogatory, fabricated for the double purpose of sustaining the pretensions of the Papacy to universal Catholicism, and to tantalize unlettered Protestants, by assuring them that their religion is of a very modern origin. The question, however, can be triumphantly answered. But, without attempting it at present, we shall merely adduce the *Confession of Faith* which was adopted by the much-persecuted Waldenses more than 400 years before Luther.

"There are several confessions of the faith of these Christians of the valleys, some of them bearing a very early date, still extant. Sir Samuel Morland has fixed the date of the earliest in the year 1120; it is as follows:

"'We believe and firmly maintain all that is contained in the twelve articles of the symbol, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, and we regard as heretical whatever is inconsistent with the said twelve articles. 2. We believe that there is one God, Father, Son, and Spirit. 3. We acknowledge, for canonical Scriptures, the books of the Holy Bible. (The books enumerated correspond exactly with our received canon; the *Apocrypha* is excluded). 4. The books above-mentioned teach us that there is one God Almighty, unbounded in wisdom, and infinite in goodness, and who in his goodness has made all things; for he created Adam after his own image and likeness: but, through the enmity of the devil and his disobedience, Adam fell, sin entered into the world, and we became transgressors in and by Adam. 5. That Christ had been promised to the fathers who received the law, to the end that knowing their sin by the law, and their unrighteousness and insufficiency, they might desire the coming of Christ to make satisfaction for their sins, and to accomplish the law by himself. 6. That at the time appointed by the Father, Christ was born; a time when iniquity everywhere abounded, to make it manifest that it was not for the sake of any good in ourselves, for we were all sinners, but that he who is true might display his grace and mercy towards us. 7. That Christ is our life, and truth, and peace, and righteousness, our shepherd and advocate, our sacrifice and peace, who died for the satisfaction of all who should believe, and rose again for our justification. 8. And we also believe, that there is no other mediator or advocate with God the Father, but Jesus Christ; and as to the Virgin Mary, she was holy,

humble, and full of grace. And this we also believe concerning all other saints, namely, that they are waiting in heaven for the resurrection of their bodies at the day of judgment. 9. We also believe that, after this life, there are but two places, one for those that are saved, the other for the damned, which two we call paradise and hell, wholly denying that imaginary purgatory of Anti-christ, invented in opposition to the truth. 10. Moreover, we have ever regarded all the inventions of men in the affairs of religion as an unspeakable abomination before God; such as the festival days and vigils of saints, and what is called holy water, the abstaining from flesh on certain days, and such like things: but, above all, human inventions which produce distress, (probably meaning penances), and are prejudicial to the liberty of mind. 12. We consider the sacraments as signs of holy things, or as the visible emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper and even necessary, that believers use these symbols and forms when it can be done. Notwithstanding which, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs, when they have neither place nor opportunity of observing them. 13. We acknowledge no sacrament as of divine appointment, but baptism and the Lord's Supper. 14. We honour the secular powers with subjection, obedience, promptitude, and payment.'

"Several subsequent confessions of the Waldenses are of similar tenor, recognising all the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation; but some parts of them are more pointedly directed against the errors of the Romish Church, such as the restricting of the use of the Scriptures to the clergy, the infallibility of the Pope, and so forth. The Waldenses seem at all times to have laid particular stress upon the point of the Church of Rome being the Antichrist, the harlot of Babylon, the man of sin, the son of perdition, spoken of in the New Testament prophecies; and they insisted strenuously upon the necessity of separation from her communion, though they nevertheless inculcate obedience to their Popish rulers."

Before entering into the particulars of this confession, it may be as well, supposing the truth of its date, to consider its claim to the term *old*. The present is the year 1837 from the birth of our Saviour, that is to say, 1804 from the descent of the Holy Ghost and the establishment of the Christian Church. Now, supposing the correctness of the date fixed by Sir Samuel Morland, 1120, this confession is 717 years old, and 1087 years after the establishment of the church; that is, 370 years nearer to our day, than to that of the descent of the Holy Ghost. This is no great evidence of its Christian antiquity!

Again, it is said to be more than 400 years before Luther. Now Martin Luther was born on the 10th of November, 1483, that is 363 years after the supposed date of this confession, and we are indeed at a loss to discover how 363 is more than 400.

But this is not all. The editor of the *Observer* tells us that it is the confession of the Waldenses. Everybody knows that the Waldenses were so called because they were the disciples and the followers of Peter Waldo, who did not begin to form any disciples until after the year 1160, that is forty years after the period assigned for the date of this confession of faith, and thus the period of more than 400 years must

be reduced to 323 at the most, before the birth of Martin Luther, and this gentleman was not more than thirty-four years of age when he began to assail the church. We believe that it can be shown by good evidence that the document called *The Old Confession of Faith*, an abstract of which is given above, and a more full copy of which we have lying on the table before us, was not formed until about twenty-five years after the year 1160, which would reduce the more than 400 years to less than 300 years before Luther.

Our object is not to diminish the value of this very old confession, by detracting from its antiquity, but to show the danger of loosely dealing in general assertions when persons are treating of facts. Another object is to show the danger of trusting to loose writers, when a person undertakes to give the copy, or even the substance of such a document as a confession of faith.

We shall now supply a few omissions, not denying that in the form above given there is a pretty accurate description of some of the articles, but totally denying the formulary is either perfect, complete, adequate or full, in representing the doctrines of the followers of Peter Waldo, at any moment after they drew up anything like a confession of their belief.

A considerable portion of the above formulary is taken from their book called *The Spiritual Calendar*,—more is taken substantially but not verbally from the description or history of Perrin. For instance, Article 3d is not taken exactly as a copy, but substantially and not very accurately; but Articles 12 and 14 are literal translations, the original of which we give as a literary curiosity.

"12. *Nos cresen que li sacrament son segnal de la cosa sancta o forma vesibla de gratia non vesible, tenent esserbon que li fidel uzan alcunas vecs duquisti dict' segnal, o forma vesibla, si la se po far. Ma imperco nos cresen et tenen que li predict fidel pon esser fait salfs non recebent il predict segnal quand non han lo luoc, ni lo modo de poer uzar de li predict segnal.* 14. *Nos deven donar, a la potesta secular, en subjection, en obedienca, en prompteza et en pagament.*"

The omissions are very many—we shall state a portion.

1. No notice is taken of their grand principle and most important charge against the Catholic Church, viz.: That she ceased to be the church of Christ under Pope Sylvester, in the beginning of the 4th century, because she accepted temporal possessions from the Emperor Constantine, whereby leaving apostolical simplicity and evangelical poverty, she became the conventicle of Satan.

2. No notice is taken of their assertion, that they believed the church was become the scarlet lady, because the Pope and the prelates

in his communion were murderers, inasmuch as they approved of or at least permitted the waging of war.

3. They pronounced the church to be fallen, because she admitted distinctions between her members, styling some of them clergy of various orders, and others laity, thereby destroying their Christian equality.

4. They condemned the church, because she allowed priests to possess their family property, contrary to the divine precept in *Deuteronomy* xviii.

5. They taught that the church was an abomination in the eye of Heaven; because its clergy were permitted to receive prebends, or portions, or stipends, or pensions from foundations of real estate, attached to churches, contrary to the above and other laws.

6. They complained of the unchristian conduct of the church in allowing persons who were guilty of the crime of possessing land, as property of their own, and not as that of the community, to receive the sacraments.

7. They taught that the church had grossly erred from the true religion of Jesus Christ, by having churches endowed with property, thereby straying from holy poverty, and deluding the unfortunate persons who were guilty of the crime of such endowments.

8. They believed that it was an attribute of Antichrist to leave a legacy to a church, and therefore that it was criminal to bequeath and criminal to receive such legacy.

9. They did not consider, that any pastor of souls was qualified for his place except he supported himself by the labours of his hands, as the Apostles did, and they considered the church which supported the clergy from any other funds to be the scarlet lady.

10. They taught, that there should be no distinction of offices in the church, as it only favoured vanity instead of promoting religion.

11. Notwithstanding the 14th article, they professed to believe that all princes and judges were in a state of damnation.

12. They condemned as vanities of the devil, all academies or privileged schools or literary distinctions.

We could swell the catalogue, but we have gone sufficiently far to show that the Waldenses would, if to-day they could reappear amongst us, condemn the disciples of Luther and of Calvin equally as they would the Roman Catholic Church, for several of those damnable and Antichristian errors; against which they inveighed in their day, as loudly as those do who, without holding their principles, claim them as their predecessors, and who undertake to condemn us also to-day.

We have given the above abstract of some omissions to the alleged copy of the confession of the Waldenses proper.

But were we to follow up the peculiarities of the several sects into which this offset from the church divided in a few years after its separation from the Catholic body, we could indeed fill many sheets.

The Waldenses proper were frequently designated Leonists, from the city of Lyons where they had their origin, as they were also called poor men of Lyons, from their profession of evangelical poverty and declaiming against riches and the possession of private property—and they had various other names from the places of their abode and remarkable leaders: good men, from their sanctimonious appearance and contempt for luxury and wealth.

They branched chiefly into the following sects.

1. Sciscidents, who contended for the necessity of receiving the Eucharist, and approached nearer to the Catholic doctrine, respecting the nature of this sacrament.

2. Ortlibens, who professed the doctrines correctly, but gave mystic interpretations by which they evaded their true sense. They, amongst other curious notions, believed that there was no Trinity previous to the incarnation, and that Jesus was the son of Joseph. That marriage was good, but its use was criminal. They looked for the judgment and the millennium upon the conversion of the Pope and the Emperor.

3. The Ordibarists, besides some of the above notions, believed that the Trinity was to be found in the members of their Society.

4. The Cathari, or Puritans, who amongst a variety of other peculiar errors considered this world to have been created by the devil, looked upon marriage to be criminal, as also the eating of meat, of eggs, or of cheese, under any circumstances. This division soon became subdivided, into Albanians and Bagnolensians,—whose errors we do not here notice.

5. The Paterinians, who admitted Lucifer only as a sub-creator, and had strange notions of marriage.

6. The Passagenians, who amongst other peculiarities, considered the ritual portion of the Jewish law obligatory upon Christians.

We could enumerate at least a dozen more, down to the Lollards; but we have far exceeded the limits we proposed to observe in this article.

The Bohemian remnant of this sect presented its confession of faith to Ferdinand, King of the Romans and of Bohemia, in 1538, but it is very greatly altered from that produced by the editor of the *Observer*, in many very capital points, especially where in its thirteenth article it treats of the nature of the Eucharist. Luther praises it, because it expresses the doctrines of the real presence, as does also the formulary

which they sent to Hungary to King Ladislaus. Melancthon and Bucer eulogize it also. Calvin, however, was by no means content with their declarations, and even in 1560 his answer to two of their messengers was, that their confession of faith, as it stood, could not be received or subscribed with safety.

This effort respecting the Waldenses is always full of trouble and perplexity to those who have essayed to obtain a semblance of antiquity by claiming these Poor Men of Lyons for their predecessors in the faith. This mode of stopping even at 1120 is unsatisfactory and useless. The best and wisest course is to go up to the days of the Apostles at once. Moore in his *Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion*, furnishes the entire evidence, in chapter xxvii.—and shows that Simon Magus held some of those tenets which after having been occasionally forgotten and revived, are contained in that confession of faith which the Waldenses published about eleven centuries later. A few more of the articles are shown by the same author in chapters xxii. and xxiii. to have been known at even an earlier period, for some were professed at Capharnaum in the Saviour's presence, in this simple phrase, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat? This saying is hard, and who can hear it?"

Should any one then ask the editor of the *Observer* "Where was your religion before Luther?" we have no doubt but by the aid of a little industry he could triumphantly answer, that it existed in scattered portions through various ages, from the days of the Apostles. As for our part, he may calculate upon our poor assistance, should he need it.

SECTION II

The rejoinder of the *Charleston Observer* to our remarks upon the Waldenses, or rather upon a document which the editor of that paper put forth as an *Old Confession of Faith*, adopted by that sect in the year 1120, will be found upon our columns.

That rejoinder, to a certain extent, places the question exactly where we are satisfied it should rest, viz.: supposing the Waldenses and the Protestants of the present day to agree in opinion, is their teaching that which has been, in all ages, proclaimed by the Universal Church to be the doctrine received by the Apostles from Christ, and by them delivered to their associates and successors, to be handed down unchanged to the latest posterity? And to this question, the editor of the *Observer* equivalently answers no, it is not the doctrine proclaimed by the Universal

Church, but it is the teaching of those who contradicted that church, and who separated from its communion upon the allegation that the church fell into error. It is the teaching of the Novatians, Donatists, Luciferians, Aerians, Paulicians, Cathari, Paterines, Josephists, Arnoldists, Fraticelli, Bulgarians, Waldenses, Petrobrussians, and others of a similar description, in various countries and in several ages. The *Old Confession of Faith*, he says, is substantially the confession of all these. Of course he says, that their enemies, without sufficient proof, accused some of them of being Manicheans, or Semi-Manicheans, and of holding various heresies. Under those different recited names, they can, however, be traced to a very early period in the Christian era, as early as the first radical departure of the Church of Rome from apostolical simplicity; and theirs is the doctrine of the Apostles, from whose teaching the Universal Church departed!

Now, so far as we are concerned, we are quite satisfied with this answer, which exhibits to us the Protestant Church as existing in all these conflicting sects, which, whilst they separated from the Catholic Church, were found contradicting each other, and were considered by the great body of the Christian world as having departed from the truth, and being carried about by every wind of doctrine. We offered the editor of the *Observer* to carry him at least three centuries before the earliest of those separatists, and showed him that, according to this view of Protestantism, there were Protestants at Capharnaum, as related by St. John in his gospel, vi. 53, 61, 67. And this leaves the question exactly in its proper place, viz.: whether we are to take as witnesses of the doctrine of Christ, the vast body of the ever visible concordant Catholic Church, in all ages and nations; or the above-named discordant sects, whose "universal diffusion," the editor informs us, "was often hidden." This, we suppose, is "mystic theology," as it is to our apprehension somewhat not to be understood, "universal, though often hidden diffusion." Invisible existence!

With these few remarks, we could take our leave of the subject; yet we will indulge the editor with a little more matter for his amusement.

Really we did not expect him, in giving us an old confession of faith, to give us one coeval with the existence of the world; though we would call one coeval with the first promulgation of Christianity, as he styles it, older than one which, assuming to be drawn up in 1120, never had even an imperfect semblance of a form previous to 1185, and most probably did not assume anything like the shape in which it was put forth by the editor of the *Observer*, until the year 1541, which, instead of being

more than 400 years before Luther, was produced only when that gentleman was in the 58th year of his age, and five years before his death.

We believe that the only promulgation of Christianity was that made by Christ and his Apostles. What does the editor mean by the first promulgation of Christianity. Was there a second?

But, it seems the object was to answer the question, "Where was your religion before Luther?" If the Protestant religion be that of the above-mentioned sects, the question was more easily answered by pointing them out as Protestants, than by producing a document concerning which we have more to say than we have this day room to insert.

The editor tells us that he did not mean more than 400 years before Luther was born, but more than 400 years before the adoption of the *Confession of Faith* by the Diet of Augsburg, and so forth. Now, it happens rather unfortunately for the editor's accuracy: 1. That the Diet of Augsburg did not adopt the *Lutheran Confession of Faith.* 2. That even if it did, that confession was presented at Augsburg only 370 years after 1160, for that diet was held in 1530; and, 3d, that even if the groundwork of the confession was laid in 1185, it was the earliest date that the *Old Confession* could claim. What will the editor say, if it be found that the *Old Confession* was not composed until eleven years after the Diet of Augsburg was held, and the *Lutheran Confession* was presented thereat, so many years before this *Old Confession of Faith* was concocted?

Again, the editor informs us, that only the germ of the German Lutheran Church existed in 1517, but its full development or establishment was thirteen years after; yet the editor told us that its doctrine was embodied in a confession of faith nearly 400 years before the existence of its germ, and more than 400 years before the establishment, and that this church itself existed in the several above-enumerated sects, more than 1200 years before the germ itself was formed! ! !

We must beg, however, to keep the editor of the *Observer* to the accurate statement of the truth, as regards our humble selves. We did not, as the editor says we did, concede that the confession published by the editor of the *Observer*, was the confession of the Church of the Waldenses. Our assertions respecting it were: 1. That this document was not, even upon the assumption that it was compiled in 1120; more than 400 years before Luther. 2. That we believe there was good evidence that the document called the *Old Confession of Faith* was not (at the earliest) formed until about 25 years after the year 1160, (not 1170.) 3. That what the editor of the *Observer* published was but an abstract of the document lying on our table, and purporting to be the confes-

sion of the Waldenses. 4. That we did not deny that, in that form, there is a pretty accurate description of some of the articles held by the Waldenses. 5. But we did totally deny that the formulary was either perfect, complete, adequate, or full, in representing the doctrines of the followers of Peter Waldo (or the Waldenses), at any moment after they drew up anything like a confession of their belief; yet the editor of the *Observer* deliberately publishes, "The *Miscellany* admits it, (that Protestantism existed before Luther,) by conceding that the confession of faith which he published, and which is Protestant in all its features, was the confession of the Church of the Waldenses." We made no confession of the sort. We only said that we did not deny that the document contained a pretty accurate description of some of their articles, but we denied that it was a correct copy of what was alleged to have been the true exhibition of the belief of the Waldenses; and we further admitted, that if mere contradiction to the Universal or Catholic Church, was sufficient to constitute Protestantism, we most fully admitted that Protestantism existed long before the birth of Luther; that it existed in the days of the Apostles. This is not the first time that we have had to exhibit the editor of the *Observer* in the position in which he has placed himself here. He may then make the most of the point which he says he has gained.

The editor of the *Observer* informs us that everybody does not know that the Waldenses were originally the disciples of Peter Waldo. We must explain. When we wrote "everybody," we should have added "who is acquainted with history;" it would have better expressed what we intended. Our readers will find Mosheim's (the Lutheran historian) account of the origin of that sect upon our columns. Mosheim is no friend to Catholics. It is quite true that M'Lean, in an additional note, endeavours to sustain the effort made by his party to destroy the evidence of history. What the editor of the *Observer* calls conflicting authorities, is nothing more than an enumeration of writers of the same school quoting each other, without a single document to sustain them, and endeavouring, by their etymologies and playing upon words and suppositions, to obscure, if not to destroy the evidence of the facts by which their claims would be overturned. They are opposed to the uniform, the contemporaneous, and the consistent witnesses, who give documents and monuments, instead of conjectures, to support their allegations. We call upon the editor of the *Observer* to give us a single passage from any writer, previous to the year 1160, mentioning such a sect or such a name as Waldenses.

The editor next observes on the list which we gave of some of the

omissions, and he tells us that not one of them is to be regarded as an article of faith. As the writer may have different notions from those which we entertain, respecting the nature of an article of faith, we cannot say how far his assertion is, in his view, correct. In the view of theologians, an article of faith is a proposition whose truth God has revealed, and which, therefore, man is required to believe. The editor says that the omissions which we supplied, if analyzed, will be found to relate altogether to matters of discipline. In a theological view, discipline is the law which regulates the conduct of members of the church, for the preservation of its order. The editor proceeds to analyze the articles, in a manner which we consider to be perfectly in keeping with the mode in which he assumed as a concession of ours, that the document which he published, was the confession of the Church of the Waldenses. That is, in a way in which we should regret to be his imitators.

We shall contrast, in some things, our analysis with his. A principle which we believe is admitted as perfectly correct by every well-informed theologian, is, that when any assertion is found to be in contradiction to the doctrine revealed by God, the proposition which contradicts such an assertion is an article of faith.

1. The Waldenses stated that the church erred from the purity of faith by accepting temporal possessions from Constantine. They produced, amongst others, the following texts to show that God had revealed that the church could not rightly hold any temporal possessions, viz.: *Deuteronomy* xviii. i. "The priests and Levites, and all they that are of the same tribe, shall have no part nor inheritance with the rest of Israel, because they shall eat the sacrifice of the Lord and his oblation. 2. And they shall receive nothing else of their brethren; for the Lord himself is their inheritance," and so forth. *Matthew* x. 5. "These twelve Jesus sent and commanded them, saying, Go not in the way of Gentiles, and so forth. . . . 8. Freely you have received, freely give. 9. Do not possess gold, nor silver, nor money in your purses; nor scrip for your journey, nor two coats, nor shoes, nor a staff, for the workman is worthy of his meat." *Luke,* ix. 3. "And he said to them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor scrip, nor money, neither have two coats." They taught then, as an article of faith, that it was unlawful for the church to accept lands, or gold, or silver, or to possess any worldly goods. They farther proclaimed, that in teaching it to be lawful to accept and to hold possessions, the church erred from the faith; and that in accepting and holding property, she became the conventicle of Satan. This is, then, matter of faith, though it is also the basis of discipline; and the Waldenses, upon this

principle, should charge the endowed churches of Switzerland, and the established Church of Scotland, and the incorporated churches of the United States, whether Catholic or Protestant, Episcopalian, or Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, with error in faith, all for teaching, that it is lawful for the church to have property, and also for having possession of real estate, and some of them for consenting to be taken under the patronage of the state.

2. The second error was contained in the declaration, that the Pope and the bishops in communion with him erred from the faith, because they did not condemn what God had revealed to be unlawful, viz., every species of war, offensive and defensive, and the shedding the blood of criminals.

Amongst other texts in which the unlawfulness of putting criminals to death was revealed to be the doctrine of God, they quoted *Ezekiel* xxxiii. 11. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked,—but that the wicked man turn from his way and live."

In this they agreed, not with the Calvinists, who have waged and carried on many wars, and condemned many persons to various kinds of death, and carried the sentence into execution,—but they held the doctrine of the Quakers, who say that God has revealed his prohibition of war and of shedding of the blood of criminals. The editor of the *Observer* assumes that the third error charged upon them regards the various orders of the priesthood; whereas we put the proposition too plainly to allow him to mistake, for we showed their condemnation was not of the distinction of orders in the priesthood, but of distinction between clergy and laity,—a distinction which even the Calvinists uphold. The Waldenses, for instance, taught that a priest in the state of sin could not validly confer a sacrament, but that it would be validly conferred by a layman in the state of grace. This too was faith. The fourth was not a condemnation of the avarice of the clergy, but was founded upon their doctrine, not discipline, that, by the texts above quoted, especially that of Deuteronomy, it was a violation of God's law for a clergyman to hold an estate, either purchased, or inherited, or howsoever obtained. We apprehend that the Protestants of to-day do not agree in this doctrine with the Waldenses,—and that the editor of the *Observer* does not consider disqualified for the ministry, those of his brethren who inherit lands from their parents, obtained upon marriages, or acquired by purchase, or even by donation or legacy. Yet the Waldenses would denounce him as erring in doctrine, as departing from the faith for entertaining, in common with the editors of the *Miscellany*

and the Pope, the notion that a clergyman may lawfully retain and use and dispose of such estates.

The editor of the *Observer* appears to be somewhat anxious to get hastily over the next five, for he classes them together, and even says they verge upon an extreme. In faith there is no extreme, it is a simple question of fact. Did God make a revelation of his will? Now, the Waldenses asserted, in the fifth place, that God did, in the texts before cited, make this revelation; and thereby forbade the receiving any income arising from real estate as a pension or salary, or other compensation for ministerial duties. They taught that, to assert its lawfulness, was to contradict the word of God, to err in the faith; and that to act upon this erroneous view was an abomination of the man of sin. How many of the Protestant clergy of the United States would then be found in communion of doctrine upon this point with the Waldenses?

The sixth is still worse; for it extends to the laity the principle before applied to the clergy. They asserted that the Almighty had revealed his will to man upon this subject, amongst other places, in *Matthew* xix. 20. "And the young man said to him, All these (the commandments) I have kept from my youth, what is yet wanting to me? 21. Jesus said to him, if thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come follow me. 22. And when the young man had heard this word, he went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions. 23. Then Jesus said to his disciples: Amen. I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter the kingdom of heaven. 24. And again, I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven." They stated that the Apostles taught their first converts faithfully the doctrines of the Saviour, and that the converts fulfilled their obligation, as was manifest in the *Acts of the Apostles*, iv. 34. "For neither was there any one amongst them that wanted. For as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of all things they sold. 35. And laid it down before the feet of the Apostles. And distribution was made to every man according as he had need." They taught, then, as doctrine, the necessity of disposing of all real estate; or, at all events, of holding it in common for the benefit of all the faithful. They said that, to deny this obligation, was to contradict God, to err in faith—and that it was an unchristian abomination to admit those who held real estate for their own individual use to communion; and that the Universal Church was notoriously in error of doctrine, and corrupt in practice upon this revelation of God's law. Will the editor of the *Observer* please to say how

many Protestants in the United States would be found orthodox upon this head, by his predecessors the Waldenses? The seventh condemned, as contradicting the revelation of God, and consequently erring from the faith, those who taught that it was lawful to endow churches. The eighth condemned, as erring from the faith, those who taught the lawfulness of bequeathing a legacy to a church,—and described as members of Antichrist those guilty of that crime.

Perhaps the editor of the *Observer* considers the ninth as "verging upon an extreme;" though, like ourselves, he does labour with his hands, using both scissors and goose-quills, and occasionally a pen-knife,—yet we doubt that even he would agree with the Waldenses in their teaching, that it was the doctrine received by the Apostles from Christ, and consequently to be believed as of faith, that all pastors of souls should earn their support my manual labour. The editor says they were driven to this extreme by the wealth which the clergy were amassing, to the corruption of genuine religion, and by their secularized spirit. Suppose all this to be true, does it excuse proclaiming as error against faith, and contradiction to divine revelation, that which even the editor of the *Observer* himself would pronounce to be neither? or if he do not so pronounce it, must condemn the great bulk of Protestants of all denominations at present in every country, of erring in faith and contradicting the teaching of heaven!

As to the tenth.—The editor must not be left to suppose that, because the Waldenses in the lapse of years, had bishops, priests, deacons, and barbs, they originally had such orders or officers. They had originally no ministry whatsoever. In the beginning they taught that the laity could do what were called clerical duties; and many years elapsed before they had anyone whom they called a clergyman any where. So that the presumption of the editor of the *Observer* is altogether unfounded,—and like his other efforts at disguising the errors of his favourites, it is in palpable contradiction to plain history. The eleventh article does not affirm what he asserts; but it states their belief and doctrine, that it was contrary to the law of God to constitute a prince or a magistrate, and that it was criminal to accept the office; and this principle was so inherent in the sect, that it seems to have survived almost every other,—so that even Pierre Gilles himself records, amongst a few of the propositions to which it was sought to obtain their assent, in order to bring them into union with the Lutherans and Calvinists, that there was one to the effect, "that a Christian may lawfully exercise the office of magistrate over other Christians,"—but that they refused to admit this proposition.

Respecting the twelfth, we have made a long extract from Mosheim; we could have given better evidence from other sources; we however selected him in order to show from Protestant testimony the utter and manifest misrepresentation of the editor of the *Observer*, when he states that the academical degrees were given, if not exclusively, yet principally for the study of the canon law. We acknowledge that the Waldenses were much occupied in teaching and learning their own principles,—but very seldom, as it appears, in reading or in writing, or in any investigation of science. They boasted of despising human learning; and indeed the editor of the *Observer* himself does not undertake much on their behalf, farther than endeavouring to create a little diversion by the equivocal passage of Reiner, where the object is evidently to cause the words "teaching and learning" to extend to notions never intended by Reiner himself. As the editor has put forward in such bold relief their version of the Scriptures, it will not be amiss to bring to his recollection—for surely he could not be ignorant of the circumstance—their very inaccurate translation of the first chapter of the Gospel according to *St. John*, v. ii. *In propria venit, et sui eum non receperunt.* Reiner is the witness, chapter 3,—imagining *sui* to be the nominative plural of *sus*; in the simplicity of his heart, and despising vain human learning, the translator informed the hearers, for they were infinitely more numerous than the readers, that the Saviour came unto his own, but *the swine* received him not. A little of the education preparatory to the study of even canon law would have kept out the hogs!! We are indeed humbled at witnessng the perpetual efforts at low chicane to which recourse is so unblushingly had, under the pretext of vindicating religion! Vindicate religion by destroying history!!!

We now make the editor of the *Observer* a present of the names which he has conglomerated, and of the jarring sects that bore them. Nor are we disposed to enter upon the arena to which he invites us; after having already yielded to him the point, for which he appears so anxious to contend, viz.: that in the days of the Apostles there were Protestants who proclaimed against the pernicious errors into which they declared the great body of the Christians had been led by the very clergy that had been constituted by the Apostles, and taught in their hearing. So far from being disposed to question this fact, we offered him our poor aid, did he require it, to establish clearly this position.

And now we shall take leave to explain shortly the quotation which he makes from Reiner, who wrote about the year 1250, and who was not always a Dominican nor always an inquisitor, but who had, previously to his reconciliation with the church, been during seventeen years a

bishop in the sect of the Waldenses; neither is the explanation which we give, our own conjecture; but it is the exposition which the quoted passage has received during upwards of five centuries, and which is the only rational construction which it will admit.—The antiquity of the sect, "some say it existed from the time of Sylvester, others from the very time of the Apostles."—Reiner does not state either assertion to be well founded, for he acknowledged it to be only a century old; but Pylicdorf, who was also well acquainted with them, informs us who these first some are, (*Bibliot. vet.* Tom. 13,) *Waldenses, iniquitatis filii coram simplicibus mentiuntur, dicentes sectam eorum durasse a temporibus Sylvestri Papæ.*—"The Waldenses, sons of iniquity, tell lies in presence of the simple, saying that their sect has continued from the time of Pope Sylvester."—St. Bernard tells us who the second some are (Hom. 66 in *Cant.*), *Nempe jactant se esse successores Apostolorum, et apostolicos nominant, nullum tamen apostolatus sui signum valentes ostendere.* "They boast that they are successors of the Apostles, and call themselves apostolics, yet are unable to show any sign of their apostleship."—This was not said of the Waldenses, for as yet their sect had not its origin. It was said in 1147 of the Apostolics, whose doctrines were totally of a different character from those of the first followers of Peter Waldo:—but before the lapse of a century, both sects, being opposed to the Universal Church, found at least one principle of union, and each sought to sustain its claim to antiquity in the pretensions of the other.

2. "Because it was universal.—There is scarcely any country into which this sect has not crept."—This was intended to signify a very limited universality, viz., the South of France, the West of Switzerland, a part of Northern Piedmont, and a few other spots. If this sect had then crept to other regions, the editor will be able to furnish us with some proof, by giving us either the testimony of cotemporary writers, and for the apostolic succession, the names of churches, bishops, and statement of occurrences. Pylicdorf, more than a century after the time of Reiner, remarks in chapter xv., "Though you Waldenses have a few believers to condemnation, I will show you nations, tribes and tongues and people, where by God's grace all are Catholics and all men preserved from your sect,—as in England, Flanders, Brabant, Westphalia, Dacia, Sweden, Norway, Prussia," and so forth.

That they crept into the northern part of Spain and the southwestern part of Germany in exceedingly small numbers, is admitted and was testified at the Council of Lateran, in 1215.

3. "Because all other sects excite horror by the greatness of their blasphemies against God." Reiner here draws the distinction between

the Waldenses, who taught no error concerning the divine nature, the incarnation, or redemption, and several other sects then and previously existing, who taught grossly blasphemous opinions on these several heads. The same is the meaning of the passage, "they believe all things rightly concerning God, and confess all the articles contained in the creed." In the several propositions enumerated above, we have seen what was the ground of their "hating and reviling the Church of Rome,"—for their bestowing upon her these pretty names, which others have continued so politely to perpetuate. But we apprehend that the editor of the *Observer* is not disposed to agree either with us or with those whom we follow, as to what Reiner meant by the phrase "but these have a great appearance of piety, they live justly before men."

Reiner himself tells us what he means by their appearance of piety. chapter 5. *Ad ecclesiam ficte vadunt offerunt et confitentur, et comunicant ficte.* "They go in dissimulation to the church, they offer, they confess, and they make communion in dissimulation." We could multiply authorities then, to show that the Waldenses received no such compliment as the editor of the Observer affects to think they did, when Reiner exhibited them as very dangerous because very hypocritical.—We cannot then assent to the correctness of the editor's eulogy, nor coincide in his conclusion; and if he persists in claiming the Waldenses as his brethren in the faith, he must, in order to bring his conduct to conformity with his principles, induce his fellow-ministers to unite with himself in relinquishing the abomination of salaries; they must prevail upon their corporations to give up their real estate, they must abolish pew rents; eschew legacies, cast all their private property into a common fund for their common wants, and sacrifice a great variety of other little comforts and conveniences, that they may totally divest themselves of all Babylonish appurtenances, and fit themselves for the society of the "poor men of Lyons,—that they may hold no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness and avoid being contaminated by the Church of Rome."

SECTION III.

We have placed upon our first page the remarks upon this subject contained in the *Observer* of last Saturday, the 30th ult. We apprehend that in our excursions, we have not departed from the question which the editor says, is at issue, but which we believe to have been settled, centuries before he was born. He says that what is now known as Protestantism had existed before Luther. The editor has not yet

vouchsafed to inform us what he means by Protestantism. We said that if by Protestantism is meant contradiction to the doctrine of the Universal Church, we admitted freely that Protestantism existed from the beginning of the church, because there have always been individuals and parties that have protested against the doctrines of the great body of Christians, and protested against the jurisdiction of its clergy. If this will satisfy him, he is welcome to the concession.

But, if by Protestantism he means what is known as Presbyterianism or Congregationalism, or Protestant Episcopalianism of the present character:—we said that their teaching upon doctrinal points, differed from that of the Waldenses. He produced a Confession of Faith to which he assigned the date of 1120, which he attributed to the Waldenses, to prove that he and they agree. We showed that Waldenses did not exist for upwards of forty years after the assumed date; that they had no Confession of Faith, until about sixty-five years after this date.

We also observed that they had, as fundamental doctrines, many tenets which the Protestants of the present day consider to be fundamental errors; and therefore, that the teaching of the Waldenses was not the teaching of the modern Protestants. So far we apprehend we have kept to the question.

We shall also continue to keep to it in the publication of the history of the Waldenses, which we copy from Bossuet, and by which two other conclusions will be established, viz.: First. That the Waldenses did not agree with modern Protestants in the doctrine respecting the number and the nature of the sacraments: Second, That the pretended Confession of Faith, said to have existed in 1120, was forged in 1541. And this will we hope, be considered by the editor as holding to the question.

At present, we have no concern with those other sects whose titles he has enumerated. When he shall say he agrees in doctrine with any one of them, we may be tempted to the examination.

As to what he calls the Bible, we know not what he may or may not call by that name. We have, and we prize above all things, the sacred books that have been delivered to us by a competent witness as the inspired word of God. We have a similar testimony of its original and unchanging meaning as proclaimed in every age, and we revere and we adhere to it: but we know nothing of, and we value at a very little the opinion of any individual as to what he may say is the Bible, or its meaning, when he deserts the only tribunal from which we can have evidence of both.

The editor mentions some period of a great apostacy. When he

vouchsafes to be explicit, we shall probably understand him. Let him give us the year and describe the occurrence.

He repeats the old assertion of Roman Catholic doctrinal contradictions. Let him do what has not yet been done. Let him give us the doctrinal decision of one general council, contradicting the doctrinal decision of another general council. When this is done, the question will assume a tangible shape—without this, his assertions are idle vapouring.

We know not when the compositor of the *Observer* received the matter of his paper; but we do know, that we gave no special directions to our carrier, respecting our exchange paper with the editor of the *Observer*. We have reason to think that all our city papers, that included, were delivered by noon on Saturday the 23d of September; and so little dispositions to keep back from the editor, the article which occupied exactly five columns and a half of our paper, that it was announced in the *Patriot*, published on Friday afternoon, that the *Miscellany* of the next morning would contain an article in reply to the remarks of the editor of the *Observer*, on the Waldenses; and it was in like manner, in the two morning papers advertised that the *Miscellany* containing this article, would be for sale at three stores in this city, neither of which are five minutes' walk from the office of the *Observer*. Our only object in this remark is to show the editor that if he did not receive our remarks on the day of publication, the fault was not ours.

SECTION IV.

We conclude, in this day's *Miscellany*, the history of the Vaudois or Waldenses. The reader who doubts the accuracy of Bossuet's statement, and desires farther information, can, if within his reach, consult the authorities to which this powerful writer refers; and with such premises before him, we leave him to draw his own conclusion respecting the question, "Where was your religion before Luther?" and the value of the very precious document which it was sought to fasten to the year 1120, in place of the year 1541.

The editor of the *Observer* seeks, in his last number, that we should take up the question treated by the Rev. Dr. Wiseman, concerning the success of Protestant missions. As we feel no concern in the accuracy of those statements, which have no bearing on the truth or falsehood of our doctrines, we do not intend to enter the lists, but will leave a clear field to the editor upon this subject; though we may safely promise him,

if we were so disposed to take up this question, when he shall have disproved the charge of forgery attached to his *Old Confession of Faith*, and shown his religion was in existence before Luther.

THE ROMAN CHANCERY.

By the Reverend Richard Fuller, of Beaufort, South Carolina, and the Right Reverend John England, Bishop of Charleston.

[The following letters are from the *Charleston Courier*, July to October, 1839.]

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 1, 1840.

The following correspondence will sufficiently develope its own history. The letters originally made their appearance in the *Charleston Courier*, were copied into the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, and portions of them appeared in several others papers.

Many applications were made to me soon after the termination of the correspondence, to republish the entire in one collection. These requests were made by persons of different religious denominations, the great majority not Catholics. The reasons assigned were, the general interest created by the principal question, viz. that concerning the alleged misconduct, or to speak more correctly, the imputed criminality of the Roman Chancery; the information which the discussion elicited, the doubts created as to the solidity of the basis on which very grievous imputations against the doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church rested, and the wish to possess the entire discussion in such a form as would better enable the inquirer to compare statements and examine proofs, and thus come to a satisfactory conclusion.

It was not convenient to have the publication made at the moment; but the desire for it having been repeated, and the correspondence having been noticed in Europe, decided me upon assenting to its production.

The letters on my part, and I suppose the Reverend Mr. Fuller would say the same of his, were hastily written, without much of that research which the subject admitted and perhaps required, were sometimes as hastily printed as they were written, and are not therefore finished productions. Much of what is thus imperfectly put forward could be made more clear and strong, and the entire could be greatly, and perhaps beneficially abridged. But I did not feel myself at liberty to retouch a line or to alter an expression, without allowing to my rev-

erend opponent a similar right. The only alterations then made were the mere correction of press errors, without any change of meaning or expression.

The discussion of the main question drew after it incidentally various topics, not originally contemplated by me, and I presume, not intended by Mr. Fuller. I did not feel warranted to omit them, though I should prefer their exclusion. If they be extraneous and improper, it is for the reader and not the writer to decide who is accountable for their introduction.

For my own part, I would infinitely prefer publishing a much shorter, and I think a better compilation upon the original subject, to giving the correspondence as it now is put forth, but I am not warranted to interfere with what now belongs neither to the Reverend Mr. Fuller nor to me, for it has long since, whatever may be its value, become the property of the public.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

THE ROMAN CHANCERY
SALE OF LICENSES TO MURDER, AND SO FORTH

The following article is taken from the *Charleston Courier*, of Wednesday, July 31st, 1839.

McPHERSONVILLE, July 24, 1839.

Messrs. Editors:—By the closing resolution of the within, you will perceive that the editors of sundry papers are respectfully solicited to publish the proceedings now sent. As a committee appointed to attend to this matter, we take the liberty of forwarding to you the same for publication in your paper.

Respectfully yours, and so forth,

EDWARD PALMER.
JOHN B. GROSS.

According to previous notice, a special meeting of the Prince William's Temperance Society was held at Hoopsa Church, on the 22d inst., to consider the expediency of petitioning the Legislature to abolish the existing license laws. After having been duly organized with prayer, by Rev. R. Fuller, the Society was, on motion of Rev. C. Davis, resolved into a popular meeting of citizens. The President, Rev. Edward Palmer, and the Secretary, Mr. John B. Gross, still retaining their seats.

In pursuance of a motion by Rev. R. Fuller, it was

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed by the Chair, to draft a memorial to be presented to the Legislature at its next session:

Whereupon the Reverend R. Fuller, Albert Rhett, Esq., and the Reverend J. N. Davis, were appointed.

The committee having submitted their memorial, it was, after a free and full conference, unanimously adopted.

Memorial to the Honorable Members of the Senate, and House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina.

The petition of the undersigned, inhabitants of Prince William's Parish, showeth,

That your petitioners are amongst those who regard intemperance as one of the greatest evils by which the human race has ever been cursed, and who deem its suppression a high duty—demanding and deserving their most unwearied efforts. They rejoice that not only in their neighborhood, but throughout the whole Union, the cause of temperance is asserting its solemn importance, attracting to its support the zeal and talent, experience and piety of the land, daily acquiring strength and achieving victory. Nor can your petitioners suppose any man to be a Christian, or patriot, or philanthropist, who does not feel an interest in the final triumph of such a cause.

Much, however, as may be and has been done by exertions, individual and associate, your petitioners beg leave respectfully to state to your honourable bodies, that the friends of temperance must always see their labours in a great measure frustrated, and their hopes disappointed, so long as the traffic in fiery spirits is sanctioned by the laws of the land, and the retail of this baneful fluid continued as a source of public revenue.

Your petitioners are not without apprehension that their prayer may at first encounter opposition from those who have not seriously reflected on the misery which intemperance is inflicting upon our population, bond and free—the blight it is shedding upon the dignity of our State, and the happiness of our homes. But at least the motives of your petitioners will be respected, nor will the virtue and piety of her children let die the principles on which they address you—until the time shall come, when the legislators of a Christian community will regard an enactment to license the retail of ardent spirits, with the same abhorrence which they feel toward the statute formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed.

Even if alcohol possessed no properties at all—yet, no wise lawgiver ought to sanction its distillation or retail. It is not needed for the support, or health, or happiness of man. It is often extracted from the substances which are required for the sustenance of life.

It consumes an immense amount of labour and wealth, and above all it exerts a magic sorcery, by which men are so enchanted, that they will barter for it their property, their honour, their families, to sanction their lives.[32] Now, ought any legislative body be the traders in such thing? As the guardians of the people, might we not hope—even if alcohol were innoxious, if it were clay, or sawdust—might we not hope, that you would interfere, and rescue your constituents from the fraud and villany, which seeks to profit by their infatuation, and barbarously cheat them of their substance? Do not your statute books denounce righteous penalties against swindling? But, if that crime be the "obtaining from a man, property under a false pretence,"—would not the retailer, (even on the present supposition) be a swindler? would he not be a knave, availing himself of the insanity of those around him, and ministering to that insanity, that he might thereby gratify his cupidity, and under pretext of traffic, palm upon monomaniacs an article of no value—but as to which they are bewitched—thus spoil them of the fruit of their labour or their heritage from their fathers?

Even then, if this liquid were only of intrinsic value, the principles which cause you to punish swindling and fraudulent transactions ought, your petitioners humbly submit, to prevent your legalizing it as a valuable consideration.

But is it necessary that your petitioners should offer any proof as to the fatal effects of ardent spirits? Is there a single member of your honourable bodies who doubts that the streams with which, by your permission, the retail shops are deluging every town and village and plantation in the State, are in fact, a most horrible scourge? Is there a court of justice, civil or criminal—is there a jail—is there an asylum for lunatics—a graveyard in the United States, which does not confirm this awful truth?

Have not your judges, your solicitors, and your jurors, again declared that almost every crime which stains our dockets is the consequence of intemperance? Do not the shattered frames, the prostrate hopes, the wasted fortunes, the ruined families, the lost souls of your friends and your neighbours, everywhere attest the ravages of this desolating foe—and loudly proclaim, that to license the sale of ardent

[32] There appears to be a mistake.

spirits, is to license the sale of poison—the insidious dispersion of pestilence and of death?

Your petitioners are confident there is not one in your honourable bodies who can doubt these things. Why, then, ye who are the protectors of the public welfare, the censors of the public morals—why should your petitioners not hope that you will at once arrest the evil? Other States have abolished the license laws, and posterity will bless their names for their deed. May not your petitioners and constituents expect that this State, so conspicious for virtue, will also range herself on the side of religion and humanity; and mercifully save the lives and souls of her citizens, by sealing hermetically the fountains of destruction?

Your petitioners respectfully insist that they entreat of you no infringement, no retrenchment of any man's just liberty. The privilege which the distillers claim, is that of the swindler to defraud, and the assassin to kill. Can any man pretend that he has a right to gain a livelihood by the manufacture of drunkards—the propagation of crime and pauperism? By the debasing fathers and husbands into sots, and reducing wives and children to a condition infinitely worse than that of the widow and the orphan? Nor is your power to apply effectual remedy at all doubtful. If you possess the power of granting and regulating and refusing licenses to retail ardent spirits, you, of course, possess that of abrogating them altogether. And your petitioners are confident, that such abrogation will be hailed as a blessing by all classes—except the mercenary traffickers in death, and their wretched and deluded victims.

If (which by Dr. Rush and other eminent physicians is denied) alcohol be a medicine for which there is no substitute, let it then, your petitioners pray, be confined to the stores of the authorized venders of medicines, as it first used to be. But your petitioners humbly and earnestly beseech your honourable bodies, so to alter the present license laws as to relieve the country from the burden under which it is now groaning. They entreat that you will no longer suffer our land to be swept by a plague, which is blasting all that is fair and glorious, with a mildew; preying upon the vitals of society; degrading the master into a slave, and the slave into a beast, and entailing from father to son poverty, vice, disease, disgrace, and everlasting damnation.

Your petitioners assure your honourable bodies that the public mind is roused and agitated on the subject of this address, and awaits your decision with deep solicitude.

In every parish, in every part of this state heartless and unprincipled men are now busily doing the work of fiends; sedulously plying

our youth, and industriously day and night decoying and debauching our servants. And your present regulations not only provide no remedy for the evil, but aggravate it; since their only consequence is, to quicken the diligence of the destroyer—who (over and above his exorbitant gains) must extort from his victims the price of blood, the sum which the state demands for permitting him to rifle and ruin her citizens.

Your petitioners, therefore humbly entreat that this subject may not be stifled in a committee room, but may be honoured with the attention its importance merits; that it may be discussed by that wisdom for which your bodies are distinguished. And, while your petitioners do not presume to dictate, but confide in your experience and judgment to devise such remedy as the case may demand—they respectfully pray that the present system may be so amended, as to restrict the retail of ardent spirits to the shops of authorized apothecaries and druggists, and to prohibit all others from selling them in any quantity less than twenty gallons.

Such laws being enacted, the pestilence, under which the land mourns, will at once be stayed; the poison-mongers will no longer be able to elude detection, the virtue and energy of your citizens will purge every district of those nurseries of vice and crime, by which they are now infested; and this little state, so dear to us all, will pursue her career onward and upward, emancipated from the most galling bondage, gathering into her lap the riches of the earth, and enjoying the smiles of God, upon her agriculture and her commerce.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, and so forth.

On motion of Reverend J. N. Davis, it was

Resolved, That two hundred copies of the adopted memorial be immediately printed for circulation and signature.

On motion of Reverend Mr. Kirkland, it was

Resolved, That the Chair be empowered to appoint a committee to procure signatures to the petition, and that an adjourned meeting convene, at Ebenezer Church, on the second Thursday in September, to receive the report of said committee.

On motion of Reverend R. Fuller, it was

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, the memorial to the Legislature is of such importance as to render it expedient for us (together with its presentation by our representatives) to secure if possible, special advocacy of the measure contemplated by us; in furtherance of which we earnestly solicit the Honorable John B. O'Neall and Albert Rhett, Esqrs. to present our views to the Legislature at its next session, and urge the abrogation of the license laws.

On motion of Mr. Benjamin M. Palmer, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to correspond with the affiliated societies of the State Temperance Society, requesting them to co-operate with us in recommending to their several districts the policy of petitioning the Legislature to grant a repeal of the existing license laws, and that a copy of the memorial adopted by this meeting accompany each letter:

Whereupon, William Ferguson Hutson, Esq. and Mr. Benjamin M. Palmer were appointed.

On motion,

Resolved, That the editors of the Charleston papers, the *Temperance Advocate*, in Columbia, and the *Biblical Recorder*, in Raleigh, N. C., be respectfully solicited to publish the proceedings of this meeting, together with the memorial, in their respective papers, and that the chairman and secretary be the committee to prepare the same for publication.

The following is from the same paper of Thursday, August 1:—

Wednesday, July 31, 1839.

The editor of the *Courier* having printed in his paper of this morning, the article to which the following note refers, will oblige, by the insertion of my call upon Mr. Rhett,

His obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 31, 1839.

To Albert Rhett, Esq.

Sir:—I find by the *Courier* of this morning, that you were associated with two clergymen, in reporting to a meeting held at Hoopsa Church, on the 22d inst., the draft of a memorial to be presented to the Legislature at its next session. I perceive also, that you have, by a resolution of the meeting, been selected to present its views to the Legislature. I presume, therefore, that no one is better fitted to explain the statements of that memorial than you are.

That document contains the following passage:

"The motives of your petitioners will be respected, nor will the virtue and piety of their children let die the principles on which they address you—until the time shall come when the Legislature of a Christian community will regard an enactment to license the retail of ardent spirits with the same abhorrence which they feel toward the statutes, formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination and mur-

der and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed."

It would be idle affectation on my part to conceal my suspicions of the purport of this passage; yet I am very unwilling to impute to a gentleman, for whose education and talents and honour, I have great respect, the motive or the want of information which those suspicions would imply, and the more especially as I have had previous experience of the candour and honour of some of your relatives, under similar circurctances.

I therefore take the liberty of calling upon you to bring to my view, as publicly as you please, the statutes to which you refer, that if you, and the other gentlemen at that meeting, have been misinformed, an opportunity may be given of correcting your mistakes; but if you be correct, that the whole community may unite with you in the reprobation which you so justly cast upon the Roman Chancery.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

Bishop England requests, as an act of justice, that any papers which may insert the memorial, will have the goodness to insert this letter.

We would inform our distant readers, that Mr. Rhett is a young gentleman of talent and education, belonging to one of our most respectable families, and is a member of the House of Representatives of South Carolina. It is of course the more to be regretted that he should fall into any serious mistake which may be, in its results, hurtful to the feelings and injurious to the interests of a large body of his fellow-citizens. We are greatly mistaken if he will not, on the present occasion, act an honourable and manly part. His course is simple. He has but to produce the statutes, or to refer to them in a distinct manner, so that they may be found; or, if he cannot do this, avow his mistake, and have the passage expunged from the memorial.

BEAUFORT, S. C., Aug. 5, 1839.

To the Right Reverend Bishop England.

Sir:—Mr. Rhett not being the person who reported, (and of course, wrote) the Prince William's Memorial, neither I nor the public can consent to your involving him in any responsibility or controversy growing out of that document. That gentleman is at present in one of the neighbouring islands, and as he will not return before the mail closes, I feel

it due to you, and the public and myself, to take some notice of your communication in the *Courier*.

Permit me to assure you, in the outset, that the committee had no design to reflect upon the present regulations or polity of the Roman Catholic Church. Whatever these may be, and whatever our settled convictions concerning them, the address to the legislature would have been an improper vehicle for strictures on a religious sect. Let any candid man read the memorial, and he will see that the acts of the Roman Chancery are referred to, as "formerly" enacted. There is even an impression left on the mind of a reader, that the abuses no longer exist; and really, sir, in comparing the legislature of South Carolina at this day, to that of Rome, in the corruptest age of her history, it was scarcely supposable that even your sensitiveness could find itself wounded.

But you deny the existence of the abuses at any time. Is it possible? Do you seriously demand public proof before an educated community, of the fact, that the Church of Rome did formerly sell indulgences for money, and that these indulgences did profess to absolve men from the consequences of sin? And that there was printed at Rome in 1514, then at Cologne in 1515, then at Paris in 1520, and other places, the *Tax-book of the Roman Chancery*, entitled, *Regulæ, Constitutiones, Reservationes Cancellariæ S. Domini nostri Leonis Papæ decimi*, and so forth, containing the sums to be paid for absolution from the crime of murder, parricide, and incest, and all other enormities? Do you mean to deny these things? If you do, upon yourself must rest the blame of causing the proof to be spread before the public. Wishful, however, to be spared so painful a duty, I shall, at present, withhold the quotations I had prepared, and await your pleasure.

Permit me, sir, respectfully to ask, if it would not be better for you to unite your great influence and abilities with the efforts of pious men, for the suppression of a crying evil in the land, and not divert the public mind from the humane enterprise contemplated in the memorial, by zealous, but vain attempts, to deny what all history confirms, or palliate what all reason and religion must for ever condemn?

I am, sir, your most obedient,
humble servant, RICHARD FULLER.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 8, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,
BEAUFORT.

Sir:—For the reasons stated in my note to Mr. Rhett, I applied to

him. In your note of the 5th instant, you give a reason for exonerating that gentleman, and showing that the application ought to have been made to you.

I denied not the existence of abuses, neither did I assert it: but I stated that I had suspicions of the purpose of a particular passage which I quoted from the memorial; and I asked an explanation of its meaning, in order to ascertain whether those suspicions were well founded. My suspicions were, that the memorial intended to convey the impression, that by virtue of certain statutes of the Roman Chancery, Roman Catholics could purchase licenses to commit the crimes which were there enumerated, by paying, according to the statute, the prices at which each could be committed. I suspected that, if such was the intention of the memorial, its object was to cast obloquy upon the Roman Catholic religion, and of course upon its professors. I considered that, if Mr. Rhett was under the impression that the Roman Catholic religion did sanction such a process, it was for want of information.

You now inform me, that the committee had no design to reflect upon the present regulations or polity of the Roman Catholic Church. I am thus, I presume, assured by you, that even if such statutes as the memorial refers to did exist, they are no part of the Roman Catholic religion; for that religion we hold now as to doctrine, as it was held at all times.

You next refer to indulgences. It is, I apprehend, quite a different topic from that alluded to in the memorial; because the memorial refers to statutes giving a license to commit sin, upon the payment of a certain tax. An indulgence is not a license to commit sin, either with or without payment of a tax.

You will, therefore, not expect that I should open new ground, by entering upon a topic not alluded to by the passage which I selected from the memorial.

You ask, whether I deny that money was to be paid, according to a book which you say was printed in Rome in 1514, then at Cologne in 1515, at Paris in 1520, and so forth, for absolution from the crime of murder, parricide, incest, and other enormities. Suppose I did see such a book, and it was what you describe, it would not sustain the truth of the charge in the memorial; for it would only prove that a penalty was inflicted upon the delinquent after the commission of the crime, not that a license was previously granted. Should the legislature, in accordance with your memorial, inflict a fine upon the retailer of ardent spirits. whilst it forbade such retail, and refused to grant previous license, it

would be rather a strange assertion to say that it did grant the license, because it inflicted the fine.

Now, sir, I do not know of any book now, or at any previous period, which fixes any price for absolution from any sin, according to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

I beg now to remind you of the precise question to which I conceive we are confined. "Is there any statute of the Roman Chancery, making assassination and murder, and prostitution, and every other crime subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the prices at which each may be committed?"

I beg to assure you, that in the Roman Catholic Church an indulgence is not a license to commit sin, neither is it the mode of regulating the price at which a sin may be committed, nor is it absolution from a sin already committed. Thus it is not what your memorial describes, and it will be full time for that subject to be taken up, if at all, after clearing the question of the "license to commit sin for money, by virtue of a statute of the Roman Chancery."

I do not touch upon the other topics of your note, as I wish to keep closely and exclusively to the question at issue.

I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

BEAUFORT, S. C., Aug. 13, 1839.

To the Right Reverend Bishop England.

Sir:—The point upon which we have joined issue is this: Was there ever a tariff enacted by the Roman Chancery,[33] affixing to crimes the sums at which each might be committed? And I submit to your candour, that it is perfectly relevant to this question, to show that indulgences were sold for money, and that they did profess to absolve from the consequences of sin. If these can be proved, it follows of course, that the vender had a rate of assessment, since no merchant exposes wares to sale without fixing their prices.

I shall, therefore, first establish these facts, and then introduce testimony, more conclusive, out of the *Tax-book* itself. It may, indeed, appear superfluous to occupy any time with the former sort of evidence,

[33] By Roman Chancery, I mean the Roman Court of which the Pope was supreme head. It is of this the memorial speaks. You may attempt to say, this is not "the Church." But what is "the Church?" You know that although "the Church" claims infallibility, you cannot say what "the Church" is. Popes have decided against Popes, and Councils against Councils, and both against Scripture.—(See Faber's *Diff. of Rom.* chap. 2.)

when I possess the latter—but it is not so. All must see that your only refuge will be to dispute the authenticity of the *Tax-book* as well as you can. It is, therefore, important to satisfy the public, first of all, that some tariff must have existed.

First, then, did the Roman Chancery ever authorize the public sale of indulgences for money, and did these indulgences profess to remit the penalties of sin? This is the first question. It is a question of fact, and I beg that you will not perplex it by any distinction between a license and a tax. The books show that indulgences were often prospective,—but it would be the same if they were always retrospective, and, in the present inquiry, you certainly must see that your argument is sophistical, and your illustration by a supposed act of the legislature without any analogy. If you wished to make a comparison, you ought to have supposed the case of a governor's sending emissaries through the state to sell pardons for money. In such a case, where would be the moral difference between his proclaiming "that a crime might be committed for a certain sum," and his publishing "that if a crime be perpetrated, the penalty should be remitted for the same sum?" The allegation is not that the Roman Chancery imposed a fine upon transgressors, but that, in order to raise funds, it absolved men from the punishment which God and justice annex to guilt—provided they paid the price demanded.

This is the charge alleged, and the testimony to maintain it is so accumulated, that the only difficulty is in selecting. Let us turn, first, to those preachers who were well acquainted with your Church, and of those I take only one—I mean Saurin. The name of this man is honoured over the world. He was certainly the most eloquent and learned divine Europe ever produced. He knew the practices and doctrine of the Roman Church perfectly, and he preached in the face of that Church, at a time when it exulted in power, and when you cannot allege that he would have uttered an unfounded calumny. Hear him:

"Rome, what a fair opportunity have I now to confound thee! Am I not able to produce in the sight of the whole world full proof of thy shame and infamy? Does not a part of thy revenues proceed from a tax on prostitution? Are not prostitutes of both sexes thy nursing fathers and nursing mothers? Is not the Holy See, in part, supported, to use the language of Scripture, by 'the hire of a harlot and the price of a dog?' "—(*Ser. sur la Pen. de la Pech.*)

"Do you seriously think that the divines of the Church of Rome, when they dispute with us, for example, on the doctrines of indulgences and purgatory, do you really think they require proofs and arguments

of us? Not they. The more clearly we reason against them, the more furiously are they irritated against us. I think I see them calculating the profits of their doctrines to themselves, consulting that scandalous book, in which the price of every crime is rated—so much for murder, so much for assassination, so much for incest; and finding on each part of the inexhaustible revenue of the sins of mankind, arguments to establish their belief." (*Ser. sur la Suff. de. la Rev.*) In a note to this passage, the editor says "Mr. Saurin means the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery, which we have mentioned in the preface to the 1st volume page 7. This scandalous book was first printed at Rome in 1514, then at Cologne in 1515, at Paris in 1520, and at other places since. It is entitled, *Regulæ Constitutiones, Reservationes Cancellariæ S. Domini nostri Leonis Papæ decimi,*" and so forth.

There we meet with such articles as these:

"Absolution for killing one's father or mother, 1 ducat, 5 carlins.

"Ditto, for all acts of lewdness committed by a clerk, with a dispensation to be capable of taking orders and to hold ecclesiastical benefits, and so forth, 36 tourn, 3 ducats.

"Ditto for one who shall keep a concubine, with a dispensation to take orders, and so forth, 21 tourn, 5 ducats, 9 carlins. As if this traffic were not scandalous enough of itself, it is added, *Et nota diligenter*, and so forth. Take notice particularly, that such graces and dispensations are not granted to the poor; for, not having wherewith to pay, they cannot be comforted." (*Saur. Ser.* by Robins, vol. 1st, p. 219.)

What will you say to that, sir? I leave you to answer, and appeal in the next place to history, and quote from Mosheim. I select him because he is acknowledged, by Christian and philosopher, as a most erudite and impartial recorder of facts. He was on the spot, at the head of the University of Gottingen, in 1740, and his work is a standard. Hear him!

"This universal reign of ignorance and superstition was dexterously, yet basely improved by the rulers of the Church, to fill their coffers and to drain the purses of the deluded multitude. Ay, indeed, all the various ranks and orders of the clergy, had each their peculiar method of fleecing the people. The bishops, when they wanted money for their private pleasures, or for the exigencies of the Church, granted to their flock the power of purchasing the remission of the penalties imposed upon transgressors, by a sum of money which was to be applied to certain religious purposes, or in other words, they published indulgences, which became an inexhaustible source of opulence to the Episcopal order, and enabled them, as it is well known, to form and execute the

most difficult schemes for the enlargement of their authority, and to erect a multitude of sacred edifices, which augmented considerably the external pomp and splendour of the Church. When the Roman Pontiffs cast an eye upon the immense treasures that the inferior rulers of the Church were accumulating by the sale of indulgences, they thought proper to limit the power of the bishops in remitting the penalties imposed upon the transgressors, and assumed, almost entirely, this profitable traffic to themselves. In consequence of this new measure, the Court of Rome became the general magazine of indulgences: and the Pontiffs, when either the wants of the Church, the emptiness of their coffers, or the demon of avarice, prompted them to look out for new subsidies, published not only a universal, but also a complete, or what they called a plenary remission of the temporal pains and penalties, which the Church had annexed to certain transgressions. They went still farther, and not only remitted the penalties which the civil and ecclesiastical laws had enacted against transgressors, but audaciously usurped the authority which belongs to God alone, and impiously pretended to abolish even the punishments which are reserved in a future state for the workers of iniquity; a step this, which the bishops with all their avarice and presumption had never once ventured to take." (Mosh. vol. 3, pp. 83, 84, 85.)

The limits prescribed to this letter, compel me to sacrifice quotations from other historians. In Robertson's *Charles V.* (p. 126,) we have the form of indulgences. You would have us believe they are nothing. But you will not be offended at my preferring the authority of the Holy See to yours. Who would have bought—had absolution been the nullity to which you would explain it? No, sir, Tetzel—the Pope's legate to sell indulgences, and who for his fidelity was made apostolic commissary and inquisitor—(See *Encyl. American.* Art. Tetzel,) described more truly the holy merchandize. "If any man," said he, "purchase letters of indulgence, his soul may rest secure as to salvation," and so forth. (Robertson's *Charles V.* p. 126.) The indulgence itself absolved from all punishment, so that the purchaser was declared to be "restored to the innocence he had at baptism, and when he died, the gates of punishment should be shut, and the gates of paradise opened." (Robertson's *Charles V.* where the whole is given.) In the *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge,*—and in Buck's *Theological Dictionary,* the form of an indulgence is also correctly given. In Waddington, we have Beausobre's translation of the indulgence which was "the authorized production of the Church;" and the historian well says, "in spite of some ambiguity, it is a permission to sin for life, and was assur-

edly so received." (Wadd. *Hist.* p. 541.) Such was the traffic in Luther's time, that Erasmus (a Roman Catholic) says "purgatory was nearly empty." (*Op.* Eras. Tom. v. c. 359.) Giesseler, in his *Text-book*, cites Roman Catholic authors, who admit readily the traffic, (*indulgences, pardons, Dieu et le Diable ils mettent, tout en usage,*) and complains of the hardships on the poor, (*Les riches auroient donc plus de facilite pour le salut,*) and so forth. (Giesseler, vol. 2, p. 357.) M. Burigni, (Roman Catholic,) in his *Life of Erasmus*, speaks freely of the scandalous trade. In short, I need not multiply authorities, for Jortin well remarks, that "all the Popish writers give up the point, and confess the shameful traffic." (Jort. *Life of Eras.* vol. 1, p. 107.)

I consider, therefore, my positions as incontestable. The Roman Chancery did publish the sale of indulgences for money, and did amass vast sums by the business; and whatever you may say about "the church," Leo X. declared that he had undoubted right "to sell indulgences and that they ought to be received with implicit confidence according to the decisions of the church, and on pain of excommunication." (Scott's *Con. of Milner*, where his reply to the Protestants is cited.) And now, if the established tariff had never been published, I insist that every man would be satisfied that it must have secretly existed. I repeat that no one opens a store without fixing the prices of his commodities.

So unblushing, however, was the Roman Court, that it did actually publish the rates by which itself and its agents were to be governed. I have already referred to Saurin and his editor. Robertson says "this traffic was so far from shocking mankind, that it soon became general, and, in order to prevent any imposition in carrying it on, the officers of the Roman Chancery published a book containing the precise sum to be paid for the pardon of every particular sin." (Robert. *Charles V.* 136.) In the *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, and in Buck's *Theological Dictionary* (Art. Indulgence) we have extracts from this tariff. Brunet, in his catalogue of works contained in European libraries, (a Bruxelles, 1821,) notices the work as *Taxe de la Chancellerie Romaine ou Banque du Pape, Printed at Lyons*, 1564—*Reprinted* 1744, and in Bayle, the publication and contents of the pamphlet are fully discussed. To dispute Bayle's correct and profound erudition, you will not venture, and remember he was no Protestant. He was for years a Catholic, and never certainly favoured the Reformation. What then does Bayle say? I will translate a few passages from the Art. Pinet (B.)

"He (Pinet) wrote notes to the French translation of the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery. The title of that book is the *Contingent Revenue* (*Taxes de Parties Casuelles*) *of the Papal Storehouse*, digested

by Pope John XXII., and published by Pope Leo. X., containing the prices of absolution for cash, (*argent comptant,*) from assassination, parricide, adultery, incest, and so forth."

Bayle then finds fault with Pinet's notes, as being harsh against the Roman Church. He proves, that this edition of the Pamphlet differed as to the sort of money named, from another edition of it, cited by d'Aubigne who quotes the *Book of Taxes*, where a good Catholic finds cheap bargains for his sins, (*voit les peches a bon marche*) and may know, at a glance, for how much he may be absolved. For incest with one's mother or sister, five gros. For murdering a father or mother, one ducat and five carlins, and so forth." In this last writer's book, it is said that the first edition was that of Paris in 1520. Bayle shows that this is incorrect, that there was published an edition at Rome 1514, and one at Cologne, in 1515. Our author then expresses his astonishment that the Catholics continued to publish the book (*il ait ete reimprime authentiquement*) even after the Protestants had upbraided them with it. He quotes a letter of Drelincourt (a Roman priest) to the Bishop of Belley, in which he informs the bishop "that the book brought great scandal on the church, and that he himself had seen three editions—one of Rome, 1520, which the Catholics themselves cited (*souvent citee par les notres*), another of 1545, and a third in 1625, printed by the authorized Roman Catholic press," (*par celui-le meme qui imprime vos livres.*) He states that he has, himself, the edition printed in Rome, 1520, and calls the bishop's especial attention to one passage in the work, in which it is particularly noted that those who had not the money to pay should be denied indulgence, (*et nota deligenter, quod hujusmodi gratiæ et dispensationes non conceduntur pauperibus, quia non sunt*—i. e. they have no money!!—*ideo non possunt consolari.*")

Under the Art. "Banck," Bayle has more on the same subject. He informs us "that Banck was a distinguished Swede—that he spent some time in Rome, and returned with great honour to his own country, and died in 1662. He procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery and published it. He not only examined the most ancient copies in print and manuscript, and compared them word for word (*mot a mot*)—and also the edition of Cologne in 1523, and that of Wittenburg in 1538, and of Venice in 1584—but he read also a manuscript copy shown him by Sibon, a monk of St. Bernard and lecturer in the college of Rome." Bayle remarks, that in the preface to Banck's edition, it is observed that the authors of the *Tax-book* finding it getting abroad endeavoured to stifle it, (*nascentem suffocare conati sunt ipsi auctores,*) and inserted it in 1570, in the index of prohibited

books. He (Bayle) has not, he says, this index, but he has the index of 1667 in which the work is not repudiated, but only prohibited on the ground that the Protestants had corrupted it. But he adds: "Suppose the Protestants have vitiated it, the editions of Rome, 1514, that of Cologne, 1515, those of Paris, 1520, 1545 and 1625, and that of Venice and one in the 6th volume of the *Oceanus Juris*, in 1533, and also in xv. vol. of the same collection in 1584—these editions cannot be disavowed, and are more than enough to justify the reproaches of the Protestants, and cover the Roman Church with confusion (*ces editions, dis je, sout plus que suffisantes a justifier les reproches des Protestants, et a couvrir de confusion l'eglise Romaine.*)

I think now, sir, that the Prince William's Committee have fully made out their case, and I dismiss the subject. I repeat my assurance that they had no design to attack the Church of Rome, for many of the members of which I have great personal esteem.

I have the honour to be, reverend Sir,

Your obedient servant,

RICHARD FULLER.

N. B. The *Mercury* and other papers, which published Bishop England's letter to me, will, it is requested as an act of justice, give this a place.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 17, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—I have just perused your letter of the 13th, addressed to me, in the Courier of this morning, and I hasten to reply.

Allow me, once for all, to assure you, that if in the examination of this question, any expression should escape me, that may appear to undervalue your knowledge, or to question your sincerity or honourable feelings, such is not my intention. I deem you to have been led to make your assertion by what you considered, and what a number of other gentlemen consider to be evidence. Nor am I astonished at this; for, to the ordinary reader, the mass of testimony appears to be respectable and abundant. You say that the limits prescribed in your letter compel you to sacrifice quotations. Of that I can have no doubt, for I could myself furnish you with ten times the number that you have adduced, and several of them in stronger terms: but you have in your letter all that I believe to be worthy of examination, and though you might add to the array, you could not increase the force.

You begin by stating the question, "Was there ever a tariff enacted by the Roman Chancery, affixing to crimes the sums at which each might be committed?" If I shall endeavour to keep you to the exact terms of the original charge of phraseology, you must, sir, as a well-informed lawyer, be aware of the necessity in a case of this description, not for the purpose of evading the question, but in order to prevent its evasion: because the change of a word may change the question. Your words in the memorial were, "the statute formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, regulating the price at which each might be committed." You observe, then, sir, that you have in your statement altogether omitted the assertion that the Roman Chancery made the specified crimes subjects of license and taxation. I do not insinuate that you intended to change the question, but I remark upon the change. Again, in a note you adduce a quotation from Faber's *Difficulties of Romanism*, by which you would appear to substitute "Roman Court" for "Roman Chancery." Now, this I cannot allow, because the Roman Court has a number of tribunals, and the charge was specifically and directly made against one of them, the "Chancery"—and this charge should be disposed of in the manner in which it was made. You will discover in the sequel that this precision will be exceedingly useful to solve the whole question.

Farther on in your letter, you remark upon a passage in mine to you as follows:

"The allegation is not that the Roman Chancery imposed a fine upon transgressors, but that in order to raise funds, it absolved man from the punishment which God and justice annexed to guilt, provided they paid the price demanded." You add, "this is the charge alleged."

I beg leave to remark that I did not state the allegation to be as above made. I put only an hypothesis, "Suppose I did see such a book, and that it was what you describe: it would not sustain the truth of the charge in the memorial: for it would only prove that a penalty was inflicted upon the delinquent after the commission of the crime, not that a license was previously granted."

Nor is the allegation as you make it, "that men are absolved from punishment," but that a statute was formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making the specified crimes subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each could be committed. This, sir, is the allegation, and to this, for the present, we must be confined.

You next come to Indulgences, and you appeal to my candour to admit that "it is perfectly relevant to this question to show that indul-

gences were sold for money, and that they did profess to absolve from the consequences of sin." I cannot, in truth, admit it; and, therefore, will not at present enter upon the subject. I consequently leave untouched all that you adduce upon that topic.

You next say that you will introduce "testimony more conclusive out of the *Tax-book* itself," and you add that "it may appear superfluous to occupy any time with the former sort of evidence (indulgences) when you possess the latter"—I suppose the *Tax-book*. You say "but it is not so." I beg leave to differ from you, for I consider the whole case would be concluded by the production of the "Statute of the Roman Chancery," as previously described—and of the tax-list authorized by that statute, and showing in the terms of the statute, that a person, by paying the price or tax, was licensed to commit the crime. And I consider that no testimony which fails to establish this, will sustain your charge.

You then assume that my only refuge will be to dispute the authenticity of *Tax-book* as well as I can: and that "all must see this." Now, sir, I not only do not dispute the authenticity of the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery, but I admit it—and I could not do otherwise without crime, for I have seen it, and I have now lying on my table a volume regulating the practice of that tribunal. But I do deny that the statute of which you wrote in the memorial, ever was enacted; and I deny that any authentic copy of the *Tax-book* ever contained one of those items at which you have been so justly shocked, and which you so justly condemn.

That you have not a copy either of the statute or the *Tax-book*, I believe. If you had, you ought to have produced it, and only two questions could have arisen, viz.: "Is the copy correct?" "Does it sustain the charge?" This, sir, would be primary evidence and conclusive. Reading your second paragraph, one would be led to suppose you had the work, for you state, "I shall . . . then introduce testimony more conclusive out of the *Tax-book* itself." I have looked in vain through your letter for the fulfilment of this promise. I have found no quotation from it by you: but I have found quotations made by you from several authors, not from the *Tax-book*, but from their works,—neither you nor they quoted any statute.

So far, then, as regards strict and primary evidence of the enactment of a statute by the Roman Chancery for the purpose stated in the memorial, you as yet have no pretence to any.

I admit it, however, to be a good rule, that when primary evidence cannot be had, secondary ought to be fairly admitted. You have ad-

duced nine witnesses to effect your object by this process. I shall take them in the order which they hold in your letter.

The first is Saurin; and for what purpose do you produce him: "So unblushing, however, was the Roman court, that it did actually publish the rates by which itself and its agents were to be governed." Suppose Saurin to have proved that the Roman court did publish a rate by which itself and its agents were to be governed in the sale of indulgences; this will not prove that the Roman Chancery passed a statute by which the specified crimes were made the subjects of license. Next, Saurin gives no proof, he but declaims. His editor refers to the *Tax-book*, just as you do, and without any better grounds. Now, sir, I have no objection to your holding a Saurin and his editor in as high esteem as you please; but as they only give common fame of a party, and not evidence of any facts, I shall treat them as reporters of reports. You ought to have known that if "the name of this man is honoured all over the world"—there were many in that world who did not honour him as much as you appear to do, and they were members of the Calvinistic body. Neither he nor his editor prove, then, either the existence of the statute, or the existence of the license, or the existence of the tax concerning which they disclaim.

Your next witness is Doctor Robertson. The Doctor is a great name, and your quotation from him is exact, so far as it goes—but it does not prove your case. The Doctor alleges the existence of the *Tax-book*, but he gives his authorities, viz., Bayle and the edition of the *Tax-book*—Frankfort, 1651. Thus his testimony goes no farther than his authority—and is worth no more. Then we shall have Bayle and the Frankfort book before us; the Doctor is no witness in addition. Robertson does not sustain the allegations that the Roman Chancery passed a statute making these crimes the subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed; the words preceding the quotation which you made, are the following:

"The scandal of these crimes was greatly increased by the facility with which such as committed them obtained pardon. In all the European kingdoms, the impotence of the civil magistrate under forms of government extremely irregular and turbulent, made it necessary to relax the rigor of justice, and upon payment of a certain fine or composition prescribed by law, judges were accustomed to remit farther punishment, even of the most atrocious crimes. The Court of Rome, always attentive to the means of augmenting its revenues, imitated this practice, and by a preposterous accommodation of it to religious concerns, granted its pardons to such transgressors as gave a sum of money to pur-

chase them. As the idea of a composition for crime was then familiar, this strange traffic was so far from shocking mankind," and so forth.

Thus his view of it was not that it was a previous license, but that it was a fine inflicted upon the offender in lieu of a heavier punishment for a crime already committed. But whatever may be his view, his testimony only establishes at the most, that Bayle asserted that there was such a *Tax-book*, and that there was an edition published at Frankfort in 1651.

Your third witness is the *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, and your fourth is Buck's *Theological Dictionary*, which both give extracts from the tariff. I could give you twenty others that do the same, but this is no evidence, for neither of them states that the book was seen by a good witness, nor that the extract is correct. Your fifth witness is Brunet, who, in his catalogue of works contained in the European libraries, notices the work as *Taxe de la chancellerie Romaine, ou Boutique du Pape, printed at Lyons*, 1564, *and reprinted* 1744. I admit the existence of this book, and that it was printed at Lyons in 1564, and that it contains several of the items which you so justly condemn. It is the work of Pinet, and I believe the original forgery. This, however, is only my opinion, and that of many critics, much more respectable than I can pretend to be. I shall reserve my reasons for this opinion, until I shall have gone through the enumeration of the others. Thus Brunet is only a witness of what I admit to be the fact, viz., that an edition of the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery was published at Lyons in 1564. It is quite another question whether this is a correct statement of the taxes; my allegation is, that it is not.

Your sixth witness is Bayle. You assume more than I am disposed to grant when you assert—"To dispute Bayle's correct and profound erudition you will not venture." If, by this, you intend to assume, that I must yield to his authority, you are under a mistake; for whilst I admit his erudition, I believe that few writers have been more inaccurate in their statements, or have drawn conclusions more unfounded than did this erudite man. You tell me to "remember he was no Protestant." Sir, I cannot remember that which contradicts all that I have learned on the subject. His biographers inform me, (Feller, and so forth) that he was born at Carlet in the county of Froix in 1647, and until the age of 19, was educated by his father, who brought him up in all the tenets of Calvinism. That he then went to a Calvinistic academy at Puylaurens! That there, after some reading and conversation with the parish priest, he became a Roman Catholic: that after a year and five months he returned to Calvinism—and by means of laws of persecution against re-

lapsed Calvinists, he became an exile:—went to Switzerland, subsequently to Rotterdam: always professing to be a Protestant, though it was well known that he became an infidel, who sought to undermine the foundations of the Christian religion:—that, as the Catholic Church was one of its largest divisions, he was most constant in his efforts to bring it into contempt. The minister Jurieu denounced him for his errors, to the Walloon (Protestant) Church, and Bayle promised the Consistory to correct the religious errors of his Dictionary. It is too much then to ask me to "remember he was no Protestant." And I am really at a loss to know the number of years that he was a Catholic, unless you will please to allow me the use of fractions, and I shall then give you one and five-twelfths. Bayle's testimony shall be examined.

Your seventh witness is D'Aubigne. He quotes the *Book of Taxes*, —so did hundreds of others: but from what was the quotation made? Between himself and his note-maker, we are told of a Paris edition of 1570, by Toussaint Denis. Another note-maker, in Bayle, states that this must be a typographical error, and that it ought to have been probably 1520. The object of this correction will be manifest when we read that this was the Latin from which Pinet made the translation, printed at Lyons, in 1564. It would be very awkward to have a translation printed six years before the original appeared,—and to heal the oversight of D'aubigné or his note-maker, the kindness of the second note-maker took the liberty of suggesting a change of fifty years, and throwing the blame on the printers. But it was not unusual with D'Aubigné himself to make greater blunders,—for he was a man who wrote according to the testimony of the author of the *Trois Siecles, avec beaucoup de liberté, d'enthousiasme et de negligence.* "With great liberty, great enthusiasm, and great negligence." His *Confession de Saucy*, from the notes on which (101, edit. 1699,) the reference to the *Tax-book* is made, was a bitter satire in which he made Henry the Fourth play the part of Mercury. D'Aubigné spent his early days in the army, in the court, in civil and military charges, and for his unbending disposition to Henry of Navarre, he fell into disgrace, and took refuge in Geneva, where he gave vent to his feelings in many passages of works which he hastily and carelessly composed. D'Aubigné does not, according to yourselves, call it "a license," but a "price of absolution"—"for how much he may be absolved." Neither does he testify that he saw a copy of the Statute nor the tax list, but he refers to it as in existence. Thus he is not a witness to more than he asserts, and he does not assert what the memorial has charged. The value of what he does state, I shall exhibit in its proper place.

Your eighth witness is Drelincourt. And here sir, you have made (what I am sure was unintentional) a double mistake. You tell us that he was an Italian and a Catholic clergyman—"a Roman priest." I assure you, sir, he was neither the one nor the other. He was a Frenchman, born in Sedan, in the Department of Ardennes, in the year 1595. He was minister of the Protestant Church, at Charenton, near Paris, and died in Paris in 1669. He wrote pretty furiously against the Catholics, especially against the Jesuits. He stated that he saw three editions of the *Tax-book*, all of Paris. You mistake when you wrote "one of Rome in 1520." He said it was of Paris and that he had it himself. He says the others were 1545, and 1625—and he gives the passage that you quote as one in which they particularly agree.

You assert that he says the Catholics quoted that of Rome 1520. You were led into the mistake by imagining that he was an Italian Catholic clergyman, and thus you mistook *souvent citée par les nôtres*, to mean Catholics, when it really means Protestants. How was it possible for you then to call the *les nôtres*, Catholics when you had the *celui le même qui imprime vos livres*, Roman Catholic press? Your mistakes, however, do not affect the question, which is—Has Drelincourt proved the existence of the statute of the Roman Chancery as described in the memorial of Prince William's Parish? I apprehend that he has proved nothing. I admit that before he was born there were fabricated editions of the work, that they were quoted by Protestants. He only asserts that he saw three copies purporting to have been editions of certain years, and he assumes, without proof, that Rome is accountable for them.

Your ninth witness is Banck—you say "he procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery and published it." I apprehend that here you have made another mistake: and that Banck never made any such assertion. His statement was, that he had procured a number of copies, differing in a variety of points from each other, not only in the difference of coins, but difference of crimes and difference of rates for the same crimes; and that out of the whole he gave a new compilation, "supplying from each what was wanted in the others?" Thus it was not an exact copy of any preceding one. It was not a document for which any tribunal was accountable. He does not say that he compared it with these copies that you have enumerated in the paragraph and found them to agree; but that he used them in its compilation, supplying from one the deficiencies of the other, and thus showing that they did not agree. Your copyist or compositor has made a mistake in the Wittenberg edition, which you put in 1538, and Banck says 1558.

Your witnesses then are reduced to: 1st, Pinet, who gave the edition of Lyons, in 1564, which I look upon to be the original forgery, and appears condemned upon the Index in Rome, in 1570, and who, as Bayle himself acknowledges, does not cite or describe the original from which he affects to have made his translation. 2d. Banck, whose compilation was edited at Franker, in 1651. Supposing all that their publications assert to be true, it will not sustain the allegation of the memorial. I shall next proceed to give my reason for asserting that previous to that of Pinet, there was no edition which contained the tariff of sins, and then to show that the tariff is a fabrication. In doing this I shall necessarily have to examine the value of Bayle's assertions and reasoning. Should I succeed in disposing of the tax book, the field will then be clear for indulgences, should you think proper to enter upon the subject, and the press continue to afford us its accommodation. I shall endeavour to clear away this topic in my next.

You state that Bayle remarks, "that in the preface to Banck's edition, 1651, it is observed that the authors of the tax book," who must have been creatures or officers of the Pope, "finding it get abroad, endeavoured to stifle it, and inserted it in 1570, on the index of prohibited books." How is this to be reconciled with another statement of D'Aubigné, given by Bayle? "There is another book, which those I have lately mentioned," Catholics of France, "endeavoured to the utmost of their power to suppress, but the Roman pontiffs would never permit it. It is the book of taxes, where, at a glance, a good Catholic sees a low price set upon his sins," and so forth. This was written about the year 1620. How reconcile both with what Bayle attributes to Drelincourt, quoting his own words to the French Catholic Bishop. "Those of your own communion, so far from being ashamed of this book, which invites traders with the sound of the trumpet, that they are perpetually publishing and exposing it to sale. I have myself seen three Paris editions of it," and so forth. This was about 1665. Such are your witnesses.

I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

The papers which copy Mr. Fuller's letter, will please copy this.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 19, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—I stated in my letter of the 17th, that I considered

the Lyons editions of Pinet as the original forgery of the editions made to the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery. Before I proceed further, it will be useful to know the nature of the Roman Court, and the duties of that tribunal which is styled the Chancery.

The Court of Rome has always had its business divided amongst several tribunals, and no other court in existence is more jealous and strict in keeping each within its proper sphere. The office of Chancellor upon the continent of Europe, was by no means similar to that in England. In Rome, the Chancellor was a notary, whose duty it was to examine and correct certain public deeds, and to judge some classes of small cases regarding titles. The tribunal had its numbers of members increased and its duties better defined by regulations of Pope John XXII., about the year 1320, and in or about the year 1450, Pope Nicholas V. remodelled it to the form which it now has. The causes of which it has cognizance are: the temperalities of vacant sees, especially in the Roman states: the collation of benefices, the exchange of benefices, the resignation of benefices, the absolution from canonical censures, viz.: excommunication, suspension, interdict; but not from sins, nor from penance: dispensations from irregularities in the impediments of marriage, created by the canon law: and the revision of documents, for the correction of style, the supplying of omissions and the proper engrossment. The officers of this tribunal are entitled to certain fees for their labour, and may retain the document until the fee is paid. It frequently has happened that their exactions were extravagant and oppressive, and a tax-book of fees was therefore regulated by authority, and any officer demanding or receiving a larger fee than that specified in the *Tax-book*, incurred censures himself, and was fined heavily. This *Tax-book* was published by authority, that all might know the charges, and that imposition should be prevented. This, then, is the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery!!! This tribunal had nothing to do with sins, either by granting a license, or by giving an absolution, or by remitting a penance—and therefore it would be folly to look in the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery for the prices of sin. How then came they to be inserted in the book?

I answer, by interpolation, by forgery—and the very insertion of them, in this book, was sufficient evidence of that crime; for of all places, their insertion upon the Chancery *Tax-book* was the most preposterous. This, sir, will show you why I confine you to Chancery, and do not leave you at liberty to run about, as you please, from tribunal to tribunal, through the entire court, in which you may find a dozen or

two of other dodging places. You brought me into the Chancery, and I shall take good care to keep you there!

Now, sir, I come to dispose of "the statute formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed."

You tell us, that D'Aubigné stated that the edition of Paris, in 1520, was the first. I beg leave to refer you to my letter of the 17th, where I show that D'Aubigné says no such thing, but that his note-maker said the edition of 1570, was the first, and another note-maker says, that it was probably a mistake, and that 1520, was meant. This is no evidence of an edition in 1520, in Paris.

You assert, that Bayle shows it to be incorrect to say that the Paris edition of 1520, is the first—"that there was published an edition at Rome, in 1514, and one at Cologne, in 1515." Now, sir, if by *shows*, you mean *states* or *asserts*, I allow all you require; but Bayle's assertion is not proof, and he gives no proof. Banck says, that amongst the copies which he consulted, and from which he made his selections, were an edition of Cologne, in 1523, and one of Wittenburg, in 1558, not 1538, as you state, and an Italian tract with the tax under Innocent X., which could not have been earlier than 1644. You state that "he procured in Rome, an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Chancery, and published it." The edition published by Banck was in 1651—the copy he brought from Rome, was in 1644, and it was upon the Index of prohibited books, in 1570—exactly seventy-four years previous to this date, and the preface to Banck's edition informs us, that it was placed upon the Index, in 1570, because in Rome they were ashamed of it, and sought to stifle it?—and yet they printed and published it, and allowed their enemy to bring away a copy to publish it to their degradation!!!

Previous to Pinet's publication of 1564, in Lyons, we should then have the following editions:—A Roman in 1514; Cologne, 1515; Paris, 1520; Cologne, 1523; Paris, 1525, and Wittenburg, 1558. These, we are told, were publicly known, might be had by any one who chose to purchase, and contained the prices at which a person may procure a license to commit assassination, murder, prostitution, and all other sorts of crimes, and all at a very moderate valuation!

Now, you are quite aware that the period of fifty years which elapsed between 1514 and 1564 was, of all others, that in which the most furious declamation was made against Rome upon the subject of her sale of pardons, indulgences, and licenses—and during this period, we are told that there were publicly printed and sold at least six editions

of this *Tax-book*, containing the tariff you charge upon the Roman Chancery; and yet, during that entire half century, not one writer, not one preacher, not one reformer, not one enemy of Rome, not one friend to virtue, that we can discover, alluded directly or indirectly to this damning evidence, which would at once have covered the Roman Chancery with shame, and given such a triumph to the enemies of the Holy See!! Luther began his opposition in 1517, and then he had under his eye, if they existed, the edition of Rome in 1514, and that of Cologne in 1515 —and he never alludes to either; but in his *Theses* he distinctly charges the agents of Tetzel with acting against the spirit of the See of Rome, in their vile traffic. During a period of nearly thirty years that elapsed before his death, he never appears to have known of this *Tax-book*; though we are told that Cologne published a second edition, and Paris two others. Here was a man who spared neither kings nor popes, who eagerly sought every mode of destroying the credit and the power of Rome; we find him with so formidable a weapon close to his hand, and he never uses it. Sir, I want no other proof than this, that, up to the period of his death in 1546, no such edition of the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery as that edited by Pinet in 1564 had appeared. Is it in human nature, that Luther should have burned the bull of Leo X., and spared his tariff of licenses, if such a tariff existed? That he should tell the Pope that he was so full of devils that he spat them from his mouth, blew them out of his nose, sent them forth by every mode of discharge, and yet not fling at him his book of taxes?

John Calvin was not less industrious, or less competent than Luther. He inveighs vehemently against the pardons, the dispensations and the indulgences of the Holy See,—and continued to the period of his death, in 1564, to turn to the best account everything which could aid him in his opposition! And never does he, directly or indirectly, advert to this formidable *Tax-book*! How many men of extraordinary talent, of deep research, of indefatigable exertion, and of unrelenting hatred of Rome, were, during the half century that I treat of, united in the same cause with the two great Coryphœi of secession from the Holy See,—and not one of them refers to this document, of which, we are solemnly assured, that at least six editions were published and scattered abroad! I apprehend you will search in vain for one writer up to this who mentions it, or who alludes to it. No! not one can be found,—because the Tax-book, which was well known, contained no such items as those which shocked you, and the forgery had not yet been committed. Neither Mosheim, nor any other respectable historian of the period, alludes to such a document. Robertson pins his faith upon the sleeve of Bayle,

and refers, in his note, to an edition sent forth eighty-seven years after the first interpolated edition made its appearance,—nor does he give us the testimony of any cotemporary writer to sustain the assertion, that this book existed previous to the period of Pinet. I now assert that there is no evidence, either primary or secondary, of the existence of any such tariffs as you describe previous to the edition of Pinet, in Lyons, in 1564. Bayle, indeed, mentions previous editions, as if they had existed,—but he gives neither proof nor authority to show that they did.

As you appear to esteem Bayle so highly, and remember he was no Catholic, and in his works certainly never favoured the Catholic religion, —I shall, unless you require other authority, leave Antoine du Pinet, Seigneur de Norrey in his hands. He will inform you that this writer was strongly attached to the Protestant religion, and a bitter enemy to the Church of Rome. Feller says that his fanaticism became a sort of madness against the Catholic Church, *qu'il accabla de milles outrages,* which he overwhelmed with a thousand outrages. I have shown you his disposition. He gave what purported to be the translation of the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery, with the title enlarged and revised by A. D. P. He states the object of his publication to be, to show his readers "the assessment of their souls, according to the rate set upon them by their terrestrial god." He does not state from what edition or copy he took his translation. This Bayle acknowledges, and states that it was a great oversight. I think I may fairly rest my case here, and say the work is therefore of no value or authority. But my object is to show more. This would be sufficient to deprive you of your witness, —but I wish to show why I look upon him to have been the original impostor.

He appears himself to be conscious of his position, for in his dedication he forestalls the objection that he is interpolating. "And lest any dataries, auditors, and so forth, should suppose and say that I have made mistakes in my work, I have faithfully annexed the Latin text of the Papal Chamber with a French translation." Yet he does not show where the original, as he calls it, was procured, nor can any of his advocates to this day. This edition has crimes and their prices mixed up with the ordinary taxes of the Roman Chancery—and as I before remarked, they are thus as completely out of place as it would be to insert the rates of pilotage in the fee-list of the ordinary of the district. This, of itself, as I before observed, is conclusive evidence of forgery. It may be asked, was not Pinet a literary, well-educated man,—a scholar? How could he have made such a blunder? I answer, it would have been far more strange, if it were made in the proper office at Rome.

Let Bayle answer. It were to be wished that some of his notes "explained certain forms of expression, which occur very often; but I am of opinion that he was not sufficiently skilled in the canon law, nor in the style of the Court of Rome, to clear up obscure particulars." That a self-sufficient man, insufficiently skilled in the canon law and style of the Court, desirous to foist into some document a passage to gain an end, should blunder and stray in such a manner as to leave the defect open to detection, is very easy and natural. Again, Bayle informs us that "at the opening of his commentary, Pinet intended to give the price of every tax, but was forced to acknowledge that he could not do it;" and he adds, that no reader who desires to understand perfectly what he reads, can be at all satisfied with the explanation of Pinet.

But why charge forgery upon him? Because it was committed by some one, and his, as far as can be discovered, is the first book in which it appears,—and because he gives no clue to what he says was the original,—and because he hated to madness those whom the forgery was calculated to disgrace and to injure,—and because he was an adept at invention in lieu of history.

You are aware, sir, that "he published some very wild chimeras with respect to the genealogy of certain families," as Bayle calls them. Nor were they considered as romances, but the veritable histories of Berold of Saxony, of Ferry Borstelstickel, whom Thevet, the romancer, makes the head of the noblet house of Chabot. And in giving the pedigree of the house of Sault in his treatise, *Plans des principales forteresses du monde*, we have served up to us, as authentic history of undoubted facts, the origin of a noble house, in the life and adventures of Hugh, Prince of Tric, an imaginary state which Pinet alone could discover in Pomperania,—and this hero was worthy of the love of the infanta Valduque, the beauteous daughter of Valduqree the King of Pomperania. His fictions substituted for history, and intended by him to be received as faithful statements of facts, are so notorious as to be unquestioned. Efforts have been made to excuse him, and the best is that given in Le Laboureur, *Addit de Caselman*, (tom. 11, p. 511).

"All that can be alleged in excuse for Du Pinet is, that he wrote in an age when phantoms were given for ancestors to such persons as, having no traces of those from whom they derived their origin, gave for their dressing up and setting forth, some vague traditions and old wives' tales, of which their flatteries made mysteries;" thus, producing fiction for facts, was an occupation in which the lord of Norroy was an adept.

To sum up then: We have no proof of the existence of any edition previous to that of Pinet, containing any of the articles of the tariff

of iniquity. They would be quite out of place upon the *Tax-book* of the Chancery. They are found upon that which Pinet published. He was too ignorant upon this subject to know that this was not their place, if a place they could have. He was blinded in his judgment by his hatred of the Holy See, which would be disgraced by their being considered its act. He was accustomed to substitute fiction for fact, and he gives us no reference to the source from which he obtained the document which he says he translated. His book is published, and in as short a time as could reasonably be expected, it appears upon the list of condemned books by the authority of the very court which he charges with the imposition of the tariff, and this is the most solemn, authentic, and open disclaimer which that court could make in the face of the Christian world.

Here, sir, I may close my reply, and respectfully tell you, that so far from having "fully made out their case," the Prince William's committee have not produced a single good witness to sustain it, but have kindly afforded me an opportunity of showing to my fellow-citizens the nature of a document which has had its day in Europe, until the criticism and the candour of well-informed Protestants have acknowledged the injustice of the charge which it contains, and ashamed of the folly of their ancestors, have stricken it from the books of education in which it was inserted; so that at present, no man in Europe who aspires to the reputation of a scholar, or the liberality of a gentleman, will venture to allude to the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery. But, sir, I have not written one-half of what I could adduce, to show that this is one of the forgeries upon which most of the imputations against the Roman Catholic Church are based. I should be glad to be permittel by you and by the public press, to enter more fully into this case, and that of indulgences, which you have unnecessarily attempted to adduce in support of your untenable position. But there are limits which I must not infringe; and I shall not now waste the little space which is left to me.

Pinet's edition was soon assailed upon various grounds, and amongst others, upon the absurdity of introducing those items upon the chancery tax-list. A variety of other editions were given, purporting to be printed at previous periods and places where they had not been found before—and in this manner you may find fifty editions, if you please. Stephen Dumont, of Bois le Duc, however, in 1664, made an effort to remedy Pinet's mistake, for he procured a certificate from a secretary of Bois le Duc, that he compared, *mot à mot*, his edition in Flemish and Latin, with an edition shown him as printed in 1514, and that they

agreed. This edition, however, had the title, *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ et Taxæ Sacrae Penitentiariae.* So that it was no longer a forgery, because although the chancery, as all know, had nothing to do with sins, the penitentiary had. But the misfortune was, that this discovery was made exactly one hundred years too late! We have another edition at Leyden, in 1607, without improvement, but unfortunately the crimes are not the same, and in some instances the prices for the same sin are different. We have D'Aubigne's differing from both, and giving us a chapter of "Perpetual dispensations, more infamous than any contained in Pinet," and which the lord of Norroy, it seems, had never seen, and the prices for which were exceedingly low,—at which D'Aubigne expresses his surprise. Bayle, however, with his usual good nature, helps him out of his difficulty, by assuring us that the tax in the Chancery is low, but the Chancery only taxes for passing the paper, and the chief business is done in the tribunal of the Datary, (not the penitentiary, as poor Stephen Dumont imagined,) where people are taxed according to their purse, the rich heavily, and the poor moderately. How will this be reconciled with the clause which Bayle gives upon the testimony of your "Roman priest," Drelincourt, that in the copies which he saw, "the poor were not to receive the comfort of these dispensations" —"they were only for the rich;" and this was the clause in which they all particularly agreed? Bayle refers to the history of Parrhasius for the proof of his assertion; but it is again fortunate that Parrhasius was treating of the trial and rehabilitation of two clandestine marriages, the business of which belonged to the tribunal of the Datary, and not of sins, or license, or absolution, or penance.

Now one word as to Banck's edition. His own testimony is, that collecting as many of these discordant copies of the *Tax-book* as he could, and getting some at and from Rome, he made one of his own in 1651—"Supplying from one what was wanted in another." I leave, then, to your judgment to settle the value of this witness. That such forgeries were committed at that period, ought not to surprise us, as we find similar ones committed in our own day. I shall only allude to one. A fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, fabricated, not two years since, a letter of the present Pope to the bishops of Ireland: he is a clergyman, he acknowledged the work to be his, and yet retains his place! Mr. M'Ghee, a Protestant clergyman of the establishment, who is occupied in going a round of the United Kingdom, declaiming against Popery, as he calls our religion, quoted it in Exeter Hall, London, to show the villainous character of our church. It was rapturously received, and permitted to produce its full effects, until the Catholics

traced it to its source, and the author, with a smile of complacency, assured them that it was not intended to do any injury to their body, nor to lower them in public estimation, but was an ingenious device to show what might be done: that he had a high regard for many Catholics, and that several of them were his friends. Yet this friendship notwithstanding, he permitted his mischievous forgery to produce its effects, until the industry of the Catholics fastened it upon him! Need I remind you of the reverend aiders and abettors of the forgeries of Maria Monk? Need I inform you of a reverend writer, who amongst many similar fables, endeavoured to have it believed that the late Archbishop of Baltimore had subterranean passages from his house to the vaults under the Cathedral, and that he was in the habit of superintending the whipping of an apostate tailor? Some persons imagined that the object was to excite in Baltimore a repetition of the drama which fraud, and forgery, and bigotry produced at Charleston. It was the force of the evidence which urged Whittaker to write in his *Vindication of Mary*, volume iii., page 2: "Forgery, I blush for the honour of Protestantism whilst I write it, seems to have been peculiar to the reformed. I look in vain for one of those accursed outrages of imposition amongst the disciples of Popery." And again, page 54, "Forgery appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism." Sir, I write these things with regret, and feelings of humiliation and sorrow—but you will recollect that Whittaker was no Catholic, and that I have been reduced to the alternative of showing your alleged statute to be a fabrication, or of permitting the church in which, though unworthy, I hold so responsible a station, to be covered with undeserved reproach. I repeat, sir, that I do not charge you or your committee with crime. You have, innocently I believe, fallen into a mistake too general in this country. Is it then asking too much, after what I have exhibited, though hastily and imperfectly put together, and not containing one-half of the evidence I could adduce, to request of you to withdraw that very unnecessary paragraph from your memorial? You will not, I trust, think I am unreasonable in saying that you ought, at least, have some doubts of the existence of such a statute as you there describe: by retaining the paragraph you do great violence to the feelings of a portion of your fellow-citizens, for some of whom you profess to have regard. So far from promoting the object of your memorial, you will raise obstacles, though probably not insurmountable ones, to its reception, and to its success; for it not only wounds the Catholics, but many are of opinion that it is not very respectful to the Legislature itself, to insinuate that it may be compared to so execrable tribunal as that which you describe.

I ask from you no concession of victory, no abandonment of opinion; but I do intreat as a favour, for peace, for prudence, for charity, to suppress the paragraph of which I complain. If you will condescend to my request, we may there conclude in amity, and I trust, mutual respect. Should you decline, you cannot complain if I should follow up what you have begun.

I have the honour to remain,

Reverend Sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 23, 1839.

To the Right Reverend Bishop England.

Rev. Sir:—You have disappointed me. I had hoped that, in a great moral question, I should not find you still insisting upon a distinction where you certainly ought to see there is no difference; nor availing yourself of a sort of special pleading, which even in the legal courts is never practised, when men are willing to go into the merits of a case. The sophistry about a license and a tax, you still introduce, I perceive, when nothing else can be said. In your first letter, you admit that if you saw the editions of the tariff mentioned, "it would prove that a penalty was inflicted," and so forth; but when I produce evidence the most satisfactory, of the existence of these conditions, you say I ought to produce "the statute"—that is to say, I, at this day, ought to procure a certified copy, from the Court of Rome, of a document, all knowledge of which that Court has for years been most anxious to suppress! And as to the notorious traffic in indulgences, and the legitimate and inevitable inference of a tariff—why this you will not touch, through exceeding solicitude to be "confined to the precise question." Yet you do not hesitate about an episode on Maria Monk, or unmeasured and most unnecessary allegations as to two absent clergymen.

But why speak of two clergymen? What (I say it, I assure you, with respect, and meaning not the least insinuation as to your sincerity, yet in candour, in justice, what) are both of your letters but a series of assertions, which, though they may convey your honest opinion, certainly onght not to be ventured lightly, and never ought to be employed either as a substitute for testimony or a mode of impeaching the character of a witness. Only see, sir, how you appear.

In 1769, Dr. Robertson, at the head of the university of Edinburgh, states the enactment of the tariff as an historical fact, and his work is

now a standard in colleges. To which I add that Schlegel, in a note in the last edition of Mosheim's (Murdock's *Trans.* volume 3, p. 12,) quotes the authority of D'Espence, a distinguished Catholic doctor of the Sorbonne, who acknowledged and condemned the *Tax-book*, and that both Dr. Benson, and Bishop Watson speak of it as unquestionable, (see Watson's *Theol. Tr.* volume 5, p. 274,) and that (as late as 1820, the Protestants reprinted it in Paris. (Bayle, volume 12, note.) Yet you affirm the work to be so acknowledged a forgery—that it is "stricken from the books of education, and no man in Europe, who aspires to the reputation of a scholar or the liberality of a gentleman, will venture to allude to the *Tax-book*! ! !" You say, too, "Robertson pins his faith on Bayle, and the Frankfort edition of the taxes," whereas he gives several other authorities. His references stand thus—"*Fascicul Rer.* expet et fug. 1, 355. J. G. Schelhornii Amenit. *Literar. Francof.* 1725, v. 2, 369. *Diction.* de Bayle, Artic. Banck et Tuppius. *Taxa Cancellar.* Romanæ, edit. *Francof.* 1651, passim." (Rob. p. 137.)

In 1705, Saurin affirms that he is able to "give to the whole world full proof," and so forth, and cites the *Tax-book*, and in 1775 his learned editor quotes the work. What is your answer? "They are both declaimers."

Buck and the *Encyclopædia* give an extract from the work, and refer to authorities. But what of that? They "do not state that it was seen by a good witness," nor "that the extract is correct." Do you mean that they ought to have appended an affidavit that they did not deliberately record falsehoods?

You want, however, it seems, some one to say that "a good witness saw the book." Well, sir, hear Drelincourt. I never said he "was an Italian." Does "Roman Catholic" mean "Italian Catholic?" But granting as you say, (I have not examined the point, but conceding) that he was a Protestant; this certainly does not weaken his testimony with me, and you admit that "my mistake does not affect the question." Now, he is writing to a Catholic Bishop, and what is his statement? "I have seen," says he, "three editions, that of 1520, 1545, and 1625, and I have myself the edition of 1520." Does the bishop deny this? You can not pretend to affirm that, but dismiss him with saying "he proves nothing!" Proves nothing? he proves everything. And of what avail is it to say, the edition of 1520 was not of Rome? You know that an edition at Paris in 1520 could not have been the work of Protestants.

D'Aubigne also quotes the book, and I remarked that he cites the edition of 1520 as the first. You reply "he does no such thing." Be pleased then, to translate the words of Bayle: *J'ai dit aussi que d'Au-*

bigne cite l'edition de Paris, 1520. "I have said that D'Aubigne also cited the edition of Paris, 1520." This is the edition of Paris, 1520. This is the edition which Drelincourt had, and no doubt D'Aubigne also. "This is no evidence, however," you affirm, "of the edition of 1520 in Paris." I beg your pardon: I think it is, and, coupled with Drelincourt's testimony, it settles the matter.

But if this book was in use, it would be printed in other places where the Pope sold indulgences. Is there, then, any proof of this? and, in your own words, "Did any good witness see the editions?" The testimony of the Secretary of Bois le Duc is full and direct as to that of Rome. Du Mont having published an edition in 1664, professing to be from the edition of Rome, 1514, and wishing to satisfy the public that it was correct, applied to the Secretary of Bois le Duc, and that officer gave him a certificate which is printed with the work, declaring that Du Mont's work was word for word, exact with the edition of Rome, 1514. Here, then, we have Du Mont, who not only saw the Roman edition, but reprinted it; and we have also the official voucher of its accuracy. You seem to feel that this settles the question as to the edition of Rome, for you say, "a certificate that he compared *mot à mot*, his edition with an edition shown to him as printed in Rome." Sir, having given the French of *word for word, (mot à mot,)* which makes it appear as if you were translating closely, why did you not give the French for "shown him as?" Bayle has no such words. He says, *Je sais qu'en 1664, Etienne Du Mont, libraire de Bois le Duc, y publia, en latin, et en flamand, sur une edition de Rome, 1514, un livre intitule: Taxæ sacræ Penitentiaræ apostolicæ, et qui'il fit collationner mot à mot son edition a celle de Rome, de quoi, un secretaire de la ville le Bois le Duc, donna un certificat, qui est imprime a la page 131.* "I know that in 1664, Stephen Du Mont, bookseller of Bois le Duc, published in Latin and Flemish, *founded on an edition of Rome*, 1514, a book entitled, Taxæ, and so forth, and that he compared his edition word for word *with that of Rome*, of which a secretary of Bois le Duc gave a certificate which is printed at page 131." Bayle also says that two clerks of Bois le Duc, deposed that they aided the secretary in the collation, and that is was word for word; and their affidavits also accompanied the work. (Art. Pinet.)

Is there proof of any other editions? and did "any good witness see them?" Let Banck testify. He travelled in Italy, and Spain, and France, and was a "scholar" and "professor of jurisprudence," and was "honoured with distinguished appointments." Here then, is a man possessing every qualification and facility, and he declares that, to make his

work complete, he consulted the most ancient editions of the *Tax-book*, and compared them word for word: and that he used the edition of Cologne, 1523, and Wittenburg, 1558. He also examined "a manuscript copy shown him by Sibon, a Bernard Monk and lecturer in the College at Rome;"—of what date he does not say, but it was "a manuscript," and as the lecturer only let him have a sight of it, (*communique*,) I presume that it was the tariff then used, but which it was no longer safe to print; indeed the printing of which was prohibited. How do you get rid of Banck? With the other witnesses you simply affirm, "they prove nothing, are declaimers," and so forth. Of this one, you undertake to impeach the testimony by argument, and what do you urge? 1st. Banck's work "was not a document for which any tribunal was accountable"—that is to say, if a distinguished lawyer should collect carefully, and publish correctly, all the acts of the legislature on any subject, and give a complete and full edition, he would publish statutes for which the legislature was not accountable! As this will hardly bear looking at, you try another method. You first deny positively, that Banck says he procured any copy of the *Tax-book* in Rome. "Banck never made such an assertion," (letter 1st.) Then, in the face of this, affirm, that he does profess, not only to have procured, but brought away a printed copy in 1644—"the copy Banck brought from Rome, was in 1644," (letter 2;) and then quote Banck himself, to show that the book was on the index of prohibited works in 1570; and exclaim with no less than three triumphant ! ! ! at the absurdity. Is this right? Banck does say, he procured and availed himself of a copy in Rome; but it was a private manuscript copy, shown him by the lecturer as above—being, as I said before, the private copy of that monk. He says nothing about "bringing away any copy from Rome," much less a printed one in 1644. This second attempt is worse than the first. These sorts of arguments are dangerous; they are almost always sure to explode in the hands of the person who uses them.

After disposing of the witnesses in this style, you come to Pinet, whom you reserve for the last, and whose memory you seek to stain, by accusing him of a most foul and flagrant iniquity. "Feller says," you observe, "that he overwhelmed the Roman Catholic Church with many outrages." Now, sir, I do not stop to observe, that for this vague assertion of Feller's, you give not a single reason. Let that pass. Admitting that Pinet was severe upon the Church of Rome, you certainly retaliate heavily, when you requite him with an indictment for a crime most heinous and infamous. Does any single biographer or writer bring this charge against him? Not one. And of what consequence is

your reference from Bayle, to a work of his, tracing the genealogy of certain families, in which his account appears sometimes to be fanciful? Is not the same true, as to almost all the writers who formerly attempted to give the origin, not only of families, but nations? What has this to do with the wicked and malicious enormity you unjustly impute to him? In this very next article, Bayle speaks of Pinet's translation of Pliny, and commends highly his discrimination and pains-taking industry. But what is all this to the purpose; and why reserve him for the last? Pinet was only mentioned as the author of an edition of the *Tax-book*, in 1564, and his name referred to, as the article under which Bayle furnishes much of the foregoing testimony; nor can I permit myself to be diverted from that testimony, by any digressions about "Hugh de Tric, and the beauteous Valduque, daughter of Valduqree," and so forth. Pinet only published an edition of the tariff, which the witnesses already cited, prove to have existed; and these witnesses at once repel the charge of deliberate forgery, which you ventured to bring against a literary gentleman of noble birth, and which you ought not to have brought without some proof. But you say you have proof. Well, sir, I will now see what it is worth. I think a moment's examination will dissipate it all, and leave you again standing upon your own unsupported asseveration.

Let us see what is the testimony by which you expect to fasten upon Pinet the guilt of having maliciously forged the *Tax-book* in 1564, although Bayle and D'Aubigne assert the existence of former editions, and Banck and Drelincourt declare, and the secretary of Bois le Duc and two scribes, certify officially that they were in their possession, and as we shall presently see, two eminent Roman Catholics admit them. You offer no direct testimony, but supply its place by two inferences. Now, when I pressed you with the sale of indulgences, and insisted upon the inevitable influence of a tariff, you did not like that sort of testimony, and evaded it. I will not, however, imitate you. I admit induction is a just mode of arriving at truth, and I take up your two inferences in order. What are they?

1st. The Roman Chancery has, you say, certain definite duties, and the tariff, even if enacted, would not belong to that department of the court. But, what force is there in this, to any one at all acquainted with the history of the course of justice? Not only is it a universal truth, that different courts have ever exercised concurrent jurisdiction in some things; but no legislative distribution of duties ever can confine a court like the Chancery, wtihin a jurisdiction fixed and immutable. I do not profess to be acquainted with the court of Rome, and the

"dozen or two dodging places," which you say it furnishes, and where, of course, a pursuit of the real culprit, in this matter, might prove for ever vain; but I know too much of courts to believe that the Roman Chancery has always, since 1450, been restricted to the precise limits which you assign to it. It is not, however, necessary even to make these remarks. I shall show, by your own admission, that the Chancery is the tribunal from which the taxes could have issued.

One of its present duties, you state, is "Absolution from canonical censure, viz.: excommunication, suspension, and so forth," but you add, "not from sins." Well, in your own first note to me, you assure me that "indulgence is not a license to commit sin, neither is it a mode of regulating the price at which sin may be committed, nor is it absolution from a sin already committed." Indulgences, therefore, being "not absolution from sins," come within the jurisdiction, not of the penitentiary, but the Chancery. Here, then, we have you, by your own declaration, shut out of the penitentiary, and shut up in the Chancery, as the proper tribunal to regulate indulgences; and then the nature and history of indulgences show them to belong to the Chancery. The real truth is, that indulgences, in their origin, were nothing more than a remission "of the temporal consequences of sin," (Mosh, vol. iii. p. 85,) that is, suspension and excommunication from the church. Faber correctly says, that they were only at first, "a shortening of the period of excommunication." (Faber's *Diff. of Rom.* Chapter 11th.) Both the history of indulgences and your admission, then, show the Chancery to be the proper bureau for a tariff, regulating the prices of indulgences. In process of time, the Popes, bishops, and so forth, abused these very indulgences, and sold them to the people as remitting sins, in order to render them a good article; and Leo X. asserts (as I before showed), that he had a right to do so. But, although the deluded multitudes were thus fleeced, no change of jurisdiction could follow, because, while the Popes, bishops, and so forth, filled their coffers by the traffic, these were not "the church," and, to use the language of your own Gregory de Valentia, that infallible and immaculate abstraction, the church, looked upon the thing as only "a pious fraud, as if a mother should induce a child to run, by promising an apple, although she afterwards doth not give" it. (*De Indulgen.* L. 2.) Now, the *Tax-book* was the Pope's tariff in the sale of indulgences; and thus it is mathematically demonstrated that the Chancery was the proper court. You see, then, sir, that I have you in this dreaded tribunal with the *Tax-book* in your hand, and in spite of the "dozen or two dodging places! !" Here is your first proof that Pinet was a forger! ! ! One word more as to these

courts. Bayle informs us of the case of Parrhasius. You say it was a case of "rehabilitation for two clandestine marriages." Now, it was not so; it was a case of incest, committed by a niece of Parrhasius, of which the guilty couple endeavoured to escape the punishment by a secret marriage. That, however, "could not shelter them, without the Pope's indulgences," (*a moins que la pape ne leur accordat une dispense.*) To obtain this, Parrhasius writes to his friends at Rome to intercede, and they inform him that it is granted, and that he must come to Rome, and "not forget to bring the price at which the indulgence was granted," (*qu' il n' oubliat point de porter l'argent a quoi la dispense etait taxèe.*) Bayle adds that, besides the price in the *Taxbook*, Parrhasius had to settle with "the Datary." Here, then, we find the Datary concerned, not with a "rehabilitation," but with an indulgence for incest, which you say belongs only to the Penitentiary. Here the Datary grants the indulgence, and the Datary and Chancery were, you will not deny, once the same court. (Furet *Un. Dict. Art. Daterie.*) This is another conclusive evidence, that the argument, drawn from the nature of the courts, is entirely against you; and I shall presently show, too, that the Abbe Richard settles this point conclusively.

Now for your second inference. It is this: if the tariff existed, would not Luther and Calvin have upbraided the Pope with it? It will be time enough to answer that when you prove that they did not; and as it is a negative pregnant, the burden lies upon you. Sir, neither you nor I have ever read all the voluminous writings of these men. I do not believe that there is a complete copy in the state. This is enough. But suppose (which I do not admit) that the tax is not mentioned by either, in their printed works, it is no matter of surprise. The truth is, that it is only since Europe and the Court of Rome have been reformed, that any indignation or surprise would be felt at such a tariff. "The traffic in indulgences was so notorious, and the excesses (as Mosh. declares,) by priests and bishops, and every inferior ruler of the church," so outrageous, that the tariff was then a blessing, and its enforcement would have been a shelter from the promiscuous and unlicensed fleecing under which the people had groaned. Hence Mosheim mentions the Pope's confining the traffic to themselves as limiting the extortions of the bishops. Robertson says, "it is only since men have acquired more accurate notions that the sale of pardons appears incredible in our age." But "this traffic was so far from shocking mankind (then) that it soon became general, and in order to prevent imposition, the officers of the Court of Chancery published a book," and so forth. The design of the

Tax-book of the Chancery was similar to that of the license to retail, which is compared to it in the memorial, viz.: a legislative regulation of what before was unlicensed and promiscuous. How absurd would it be some centuries hence to argue, that the legislature did not pass the *License Laws*, because men who viewed these laws as an attempt to remedy the evil did not upbraid the legislature with them! No, sir, the tariff would have appeared no evil in those days. It was merciful in comparison with the gross unbridled profligacy of avarice, which both Luther and Calvin saw everywhere around them, and which caused both to abandon a church which practised such things. I repeat, however, that there is no evidence that they do not mention the book. Be that as it may, the book was certainly known to them, since the Protestant princes inserted it in their cause for rejecting the Council of Trent, (held 1545-6, Bayle, volume 3, p. 78.) This, then, is the worth of your second argument.

I have now to say a word as to one or two minor matters, but which go to fill up your argument, and appear plausible until examined. You profess, it seems, to have discovered two contradictions in Bayle, and you ask, "how can I reconcile these?" one is that Bayle says, "people are taxed according to their purse, the rich heavily, the poor moderately;" and in the edition of 1520, in Drelincourt's possession, "the poor were not to receive the indulgences," they were "only for the rich." Do you ask "how I reconcile these?" I answer, simply by referring to the original, and showing that neither Bayle nor Drelincourt assert what you quote. Bayle simply says, "it was necessary to settle with the Datary according to a man's circumstances," and refers to the case of Parrhasius and the Datary at Rome; the passage from the edition in the possession of Drelincourt, I have cited already in French; there is not a word about, "only for the rich;" it is "they that have no money at all (*non sunt*,) cannot procure the indulgences." Where is now the contradiction? It exists only in your own quotations.

The other discrepancy you profess to have detected, is between D'Aubigne and Drelincourt's book, and the index of prohibited works; and you ask again, "how will I reconcile this?" I answer in exactly the same way—by referring to the original, and correcting your quotations. D'Augibne says there were Catholics (and I trust there were many,) who wished not to "suppress" but "to extirpate" (*extirper*) altogether this damning book; "but the Holy See would never permit it," instead of doing what they wished, and at once abolishing the shocking practice, the Inquisitions of Rome and Spain, only condemn the book, "on the ground (as they pretend) that the Protestants had cor-

rupted it,"—*ne l'ont condamnee qu'en supposant que les heretiques l'avaient corrompue.* Bayle well adds, "this does not show that the church abhorred the rules, but may only mean, that they repented having allowed the book to be made public, and wished to keep it among the secret things of the Cabinet." This was the nature of the prohibition, and Banck found, at Rome a manuscript used. Who is, then surprised, that Claude D'Espence and others, who looked upon the practice as a great moral enormity, viewed these acts of the Inquisition as anything but the extirpating they desired? or that D'Aubigne considered them in their true light, viz.: as an indirect recognition of the principles of the tariff, since they do not disclaim or charge forgery as you do, but admit the book and only prohibit on pretence "that the heretics had corrupted it." Where, then, is the discrepancy? and as to Drelincourt's declaration to the Bishop, what has that to do with acts passed by the Inquisition of Rome and Spain? You certainly do not mean that these would have prevented the sale which he mentioned in Paris. So much for the contradictions you detect.

You affirm that Pinet's edition was soon assailed, on the ground of the absurdity of making the Chancery the tribunal of the tariff. Of this, however, you furnish no proof. I have already shown that the Chancery was the proper court, and the authentic editions, which "cannot be disavowed," (Bayle) have their titles accordingly. That of Rome is entitled, *Taxæ cancellariæ per Marcellum Silber, alias Frank, Romæ in campo Flore, anno MDXIV. die xviii. Novembris, impressæ, finiunt feliciter.* That of Paris, 1520, is *Taxæ Cancellariæ apostolicæ et Taxæ pœnitentiariæ itidem apostolicæ.* What, after this, becomes of your assertion that Pinet's edition "was assailed" and that "Dumont made an effort to remedy Pinet's mistakes," and so forth? As to different editions varying in some items of assessment, this is exactly what takes place in all legislation of this character. Are not our taxes altered at almost every session? that variation proves there was no forgery, since, in that case, all the editions would have scrupulously conformed to the spurious original.

So, too, in respect to the coins, and Pinet's confessing, in his preface, that he did not know the precise value of some. That you attempt to make these proofs of forgery, shows that you are indeed deplorably in want of evidence. They are proof (if any farther were needed) of the contrary. Any man who has ever been to Europe knows, that a traveller there, has to study a new sort of currency in almost every little principality and canton. It is not surprising, therefore, that Pinet could not give the precise value of all the coins mentioned in some of

the copies of the *Tax-book*, edited, as they had been in different places, and as Banck attests of the old copies he examined—giving the prices in different sorts of money. On the other hand, it is certain, that had this work been anything but a translation of taxes previously existing, he never would have made the confession which you urge against him, viz.: that he could not give the value of every tax.

Really, sir, you must forgive me for saying that I cannot consent to follow you in these sort of criticisms. They consume time, of which I have none to spare, and contribute nothing to truth. Here is the fact. We are both quoting Bayle and searching his works for evidence. I repeat it, he was no Protestant. You assert that he was a Catholic only for a short time, and then became an infidel. The truth is, that as to religion, he is just the judge for this question, perfectly impartial between Catholics and Protestants. And as to the bibliographical point, —to which special pleading has degraded this discussion—you know, as well as I, that he is acknowledged authority all over Europe, and hence, notwithstanding your opinion expressed of him, as well as Saurin and others, you eagerly avail yourself of any evidence he gives in your favour. Now let us no longer be making extracts. All the testimony collected by Bayle, and his judgment on them with their grounds, will not occupy more space than your two letters. Give then, at once, not loose extracts in English, with attempts to detect contradictions, which must be in vain, but the whole translated word for word. Will you do this? I apprehend not. I believe that all men would come to the conclusion Bayle does, on the evidence which he cites, and on which he remarks, as they would see, with perfect impartiality. As I have not room for the whole, I will give his conclusions. "Suppose that the heretics have corrupted the work, yet the editions of Rome, 1514; Cologne, 1515; Paris, 1520, and so forth, cannot be disavowed, and these are more than enough, to justify the Church of Rome with confusion." Again in summing up the evidence—"My opinion is, that the Catholic controvertists, who can never be able to invalidate (*S'inscairi en faux*) the edition of Rome nor Paris, are in a very awkward predicament (*un fort grand embarras*). One may see this in the answer which l'Abbe Richard makes to M. Jurieu. This minister had exposed the abomination of the *Tax-book*. The Abbe's defence is, that they were only individual acts (*faits particuliers*), and never authorized by the laws and canons of the Church." Then follows the Abbe's reply in full, in which he says, that "Jurieu produces an ancient book of the Roman Chancery;" and his whole answer admits that the taxes existed in Rome, that they began under John XXII. (the very Pope who you

say regulated the Courts! !) in 1320. But, that the Church suppressed them as often as they appeared; and he concludes thus: "Let M. Jurieu, then, be assured that the acts of the Court of Rome were individual acts, and not the acts of the Church." Bayle gives several reasons, which he thinks sufficient to fix the odium on the Church; but I do not cite them. I have never once attributed the work to the canons of the Church; I ascribed it to the Chancery, and l'Abbe Richard admits this fully. Here, then, is a single witness, of himself sufficient to overthrow all your argument about a forgery. The editors of the *Nouv. Dict, Histor. Biograph.* (Caen, 1768)—Roman Catholics and violent against the Reformation—refer (under Art. Pinet and Banck) to Pinet's *Translation* of the *Tax-book*, without the least pretence of its being a forgery. I have other authorities, but I give only one, viz.: Claude D'Espence. I mentioned him before as cited by Schlegel; and Drelincourt also refers to his language against the *Tax-book.* (Bayle.) D'Espence was a doctor of the Sorbonne, and refused a Cardinal's Hat in 1555. (Lemprier's *Un. Biograph.*) Here, then, is another most distinguished Roman Catholic, and a man whose piety and magnanimity must command the admiration of all; what does he say? "Provided money can be extorted everything prohibited is permitted. There is almost nothing forbidden that is not dispensed with for money. So that, as Horace said of his age, the greatest crime a person can commit is to be poor. Shameful to relate! They give power to priests to have concubines, and to live with their harlots who have children by them, upon paying an annual tribute. And, in some places, they oblige priests to pay this tax, saying they may keep a concubine if they please. There is a printed book, which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled, *The Taxes of the Apostolical Chancery*, from which one may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the books of," and so forth. "And of those crimes there are some which persons may have liberty to commit for money, while absolutions from all of them after they have been committed, may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror."—Claudius Espence's *Comment.* ad Cap. 1, Epist. ad Tit. deg. 11.

Here then I stop, and let us see how matters stand now. You rest your whole case on proving Pinet's work to have been a deliberate forgery; and after it really seems an exercise of moderation not at once to "ask a concession of victory." But where are you now? I confess that when, at the request of some of my fellow-citizens, I hastily wrote the memorial, and casually used the comparison, I had probably only seen the statements of Saurin and Robertson, and these were sufficient

to satisfy my mind as to the tariff. What Protestant community will believe that they would record, as you affirm, a palpable and notorious falsehood? I am now surprised, that in this corner of the world, in a sequestered village, without access to any of those large libraries of ecclesiastical documents, by which I am persuaded I could in a moment have settled the point, I have yet been able to procure such a mass of testimony to a truth, which it has been the effort of the greatest part of Europe to suppress. Let us recapitulate a little.

1. Of the two arguments on which you rely one is good for nothing, and the other recoils fatally and establishes decisively the very point you deny!!

2. There is full proof of editions long before Pinet's. His was in 1564, and L'Abbe Richard admits the tariff of sin 1320. Dumont and two clerks and the secretary of Bois le Duc establish that of Rome 1554, and Cologne 1515—and Drelincourt and D'Aubigne prove that of Paris 1520. Banck proves that of Cologne 1523; Drelincourt proves that of Paris 1545. 1546 is the date of the Council of Trent, and the protest of the Protestant princes, and in their protest they inserted a copy of the tariff—(This Bayle supposes to be the copy which Pinet followed as "they agree precisely," *resemblent parfaitement.*) Banck proves an edition of Wittenberg 1558. About 1555, Claude D'Espence flourished, and he admits the *Tax-book* as existing "for some considerable time!"

3. You assert that the *Tax-book* of sin is a palpable and acknowledged forgery. This may be your sincere conviction. But it is only at this late day, and on this side the water, that such a defence could be set up. Espence, about 1555, admits the work. In 1570, even the Inquisitions of Spain and Rome do not pretend to any forgery; but only that "it had been corrupted." And L'Abbe Richard, in Bayle's time, and in Paris, where certainly the matter could have been settled when Jurieu preached against the abomination of the *Tax-book*, and produced an ancient copy, did not for a moment attempt to say that there was forgery; but admits the guilt of the Chancery, and informs us when that Court commenced to issue tariffs for sin, viz., 1320; and rests his whole defence on denying that the Church could be held responsible for the acts of the Chancery.

4. You assert that the tariff is, in Europe, so universally acknowledged to be a fable, "that well-informed Protestants, ashamed of the folly of their ancestors, have stricken it from the books of education, and that no man in Europe who aspires to the reputation of a scholar, or the liberality of a gentleman will venture even to allude to it." And yet, in 1820, it is printed by the Protestants in Paris. In the latest

edition of Mosheim, Schlegel cites D'Espence in proof of it; and it stands recorded in the works of Benson, Watson, and Robertson; and, I venture to say, in every Protestant work, where it was ever mentioned! So much for the former part of your remark, and as to the latter, an humble individual like myself must, I suppose, be content to occupy a place with Robertson, Bishop Watson, and others, who are so excessively liberal and ignorant, as to be convinced by testimony, which is full, conclusive, and irrefragable.

Your remarks on an English divine, whom I do not know, and a clergyman in Baltimore, whom I think I do know, (and who, if my suspicious be correct, is one of the most honourable upright and devoted Presbyterian pastors in the country,)—these remarks require no comment from me. Whittaker, however, demands a passing tribute. He declares, you say, "that forgery is peculiar to Protestantism, and that he looked in vain for one of these accursed outrages amongst the disciples of Popery." Such is his broad assertion; and you endorse it, by adding, "it was the force of evidence, which urged him to write this." Well, sir, if this be so, Protestantism, instead of reforming one part of Europe, and more than half reforming the other, as some ignorant and illiberal people think, has indeed proved a curse to the world. But, without saying a word about the notorious third Lateran Council, which makes not only falsehood, but perjury, a virtue, in behalf of the church—omitting that, will you permit me respectfully, to ask you one question? Did neither you nor Whittaker, in "looking" for an example, ever chance to light upon a certain book called Pascal's *Provincial Letters*? Remember, sir, Pascal[34] was no Protestant; he was one of the most brilliant ornaments of your church and an ornament to his age; and he writes of the Jesuits, whom I venture to pronounce the most enlightened as they were certainly the most powerful, of all the Roman Catholic orders. And what does he say of them, and their principles of action? I quote from page 329, where he speaks of their mode "of defending themselves against a passage in one of their writings," with which (as in the case of the *Tax-book*) they were sometimes rather ungraciously twitted. *La plus innocente maniere de vous defendre, est desavouer hardiment les choses les plus evidentes.* "To deny boldly the most evident things, is your most innocent sort of defence." *Vous forgez des ecrits, pour rendre vos ennemis odieux, comme la lettre d'un ministrea M. Arnauld, pour faire croire*, and so forth. "You forge writings to make your enemies appear odious, as the letter of a minister to M. Arnauld, in order to have

[34] Pascal's well known, and avowed hatred of the Jesuits totally disqualifies him as a witness against the Society of Jesus.—Ed.

it believed," and so forth. *Vous attribuez, d'autres fois, a vos adversaries des ecrits pleins d'impiete, comme la lettre circulaire des Jansenistes.* "You falsely attribute at other times to your adversaries writings, full of impiety, as the circular epistle of the Jansenists." *Vous citez, quelquefois, les livres qui ne furent jamais au monde, comme les constitutions du Saint Sacrement, d'ou vous rapportez des passages que vous fabriquez a plaisir.* "You cite sometimes books that were never in the world, as the constitutions of the Holy Sacrament, out of which you quote passages fabricated by you at pleasure." These are the words of Pascal, and these the principles of the Jesuits. Yet, Whittaker, good man, cannot for the life of him, find one instance of forgery among the Catholics, and declares that it is "peculiar to the reformed;" and you vindicate his assertion!! No apology is needed for citing these passages. The case demands it, and while the remark made by Whittaker, and affirmed by you to be the truth, is a sweeping denunciation of the whole Protestant world, my quotation (like all I have said) has reference to the morals of an age long past. These very Jesuits were the persons who, in 1570, issued an *Index Prohibitorum*, in which they do not pretend a forgery, but only a corruption. That such men stopped there, can only be accounted for by remembering that they lived, not in the nineteenth, but in the sixteenth century; when, although goaded with the book by the Protestants, even they felt that the thing was yet too notorious for them to hazard farther.

One word more as to the request with which you close. From the very first, I have declared that the committee had no intention to attack the Church of Rome; and I cannot now but add that I think you have, most gratuitously, forced on a controversy, by which you can assuredly have done that church no good. If your object was not strife, but "peace and charity," why did you not make the request in your first communication? And why even now, after using such holy terms, do you finish off with a flourish about "following it up?" I owe it both to you and myself not to put upon this language the construction it at first seems to demand. Yet what is its meaning? And why employ it at all, if your wish be for "peace and charity?" But you assure me that this is your desire; and you appeal to my feelings, as a Carolinian, and a man, and a Christian, to expunge from the memorial the unnecessary paragraph—as it cannot promote, but will provoke opposition to the address, and may seem disrespectful to the Legislature; and does "wound the feelings of many of my fellow-citizens:" You "ask of me (you say) no concession of victory, no abandonment of opinion, but you entreat,

as a favour, for peace, for prudence, for charity, that I will suppress the paragraph of which you complain."

Now, sir, here is a request, with which I, at once and most cheerfully, comply, as far as is in my power. I have no apprehensions that the Legislature would impute to the Prince William's meeting any want of respect. It is the love we bear our native State, and our desire to see her maintaining her high and noble station—as well as a wish to rescue our fellow-men from destruction—which has prompted our petition, that a great and growing sin may no longer be made the subject of license and taxation: what you suggest, therefore, as to this, has no weight with me. But to your other reasons I have no hesitation in yielding. To refuse would be to give you good ground for questioning the sincerity of my repeated assurances that I never meant to attack a religious sect or to insult its members. As to the *Tax-book* of Iniquity, my opinion has been fully confirmed and established, by the investigation required in this discussion; but "peace and charity" are names which should be very dear to every disciple of the Lord Jesus, and "for peace—for charity," to prevent unnecessary "opposition to the memorial," and to satisfy those to whom you allude, that I had no design "to do violence to their feelings," simply from these considerations, I express my free and full consent, as an individual, to the alteration you so earnestly entreat. This, you at once see, is all I can do. Had you been present at the meeting, and made this request, I, as one of the committee, would have acceded readily. At present, you are aware, that the report of the committee belongs not to me, but to the body which adopted it. As the offensive clause is entirely unimportant, being only a comparison, I make no doubt but that the gentlemen who may present the memorial to the Legislature, will feel themselves at liberty to omit it, if requested to do so, for the reasons you assign. As to this, however, I, of course, can say nothing.

I conclude, by expressing a hope, that no word has been allowed to escape me in this paper, which can be regarded by you as a departure from the courtesy I wish to observe. If so, I beg leave to say that I am unconscious of it, and to assure you that it has been wholly unintentional. I have the honour to remain, reverend sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

RICHARD FULLER.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 29, 1839.

To the Editors of the Charleston Courier:

Gentlemen:—I have just now laid down your paper of this morning,

which contains the letter of the Rev. Richard Fuller, dated the 23rd inst.

As I am very much pressed by duties which will admit of no postponement, I shall not be able to send my reply this day, but trust I shall be able to furnish it tomorrow. I flatter myself that I shall be able to meet his new testimony, and to show that his remarks on my topics will not sustain his conclusions. Should he then consent to let the special case of the "Statute enacted by the Roman Chancery," be judged of by the testimony and arguments adduced, I shall consent to abandon my special pleading, and in considering the merits of the questions of indulgences, and their abuse, I shall be ready, in return, for his concession, in consenting to withdraw the clause objected to by me from the memorial, to grant him, that enormous and criminal abuses did exist, although I have no doubt that the *Tax-book* was interpolated, and that the editions which he refers to should be considered forgeries.

I shall, however, if I mistake not, satisfy him that the Roman Catholic Church condemned those abuses, and used great efforts for their correction.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 30, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—You tell me that I have disappointed you: I regret it; but I must say that you have not disappointed me. I calculated that you wrote the truth, when you asserted that you meant nothing offensive to Roman Catholics by the passage in the memorial which has given rise to this controversy. Your acceding to my request is the best proof you could furnish, that my estimate of you as a gentleman was correct. I am quite certain that, though it is not in your power to strike the passage from the memorial, it is quite in your power to prevail upon the other gentlemen who have adopted it to consent to its being cancelled; and, of course, so far, we shall stand as if this clause never had been. I also calculated that you would use your best exertions to sustain the position you had taken. Neither have I been disappointed. I was prepared for ingenuity and industry, and I see full evidence of both.

But I have disappointed you, because I did not abandon the original question, and because I had recourse to special pleading, instead of entering into the merits of the case. Sir, I apprehend the question

originally was, whether there was "a statute enacted by the Roman Chancery, making assassination and murder and prostitution and every crime subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed." Now I still consider the merits of the case to be found solely and singly in the question, whether the Roman Chancery did enact such a statute: and I therefore avoid every other. You produced a number of witnesses and examined their merits. Yours was a special charge, I made a special reply. The question is one rather of simple inquiry as to the truth of a special allegation made by you, than of religious controversy. But I am free to avow that if such a statute was enacted, the tribunal and its abettors were therein guilty of the most irreligious misconduct; and I now repeat what I originally stated. I wish, "if you be correct, that the whole community may unite with you in the reprobation you so justly cast upon the Roman Chancery." The *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery was produced by you as the statute. I admitted that there was a *Tax-book*, but I denied that the copies, which, upon the authority of Bayle, you produced, were correct. I stated that they had been interpolated, and I gave you as my opinion, that Pinet was the original fabricator. You now undertake to show that I had no ground for asserting that there had been an interpolation, and why my opinion respecting Pinet is untenable. The two questions are perfectly distinct. I have no doubt whatever respecting the first, that is the interpolation. With regard to the second, viz., Pinet's being the original fabricator, I am not so positive; but it is next to evident to my mind that he was. I see no reason to change my opinion—and such is the opinion of "many critics much more respectable that I can pretend to be." These, sir, were from the beginning my assertions.

Pinet's book was published in 1564. My statement was that there existed no previous edition of the *Tax-book* which contained these iniquitous items, whose existence, upon a genuine copy, would appear to sustain your assertion, that such a statute as you describe was enacted by the Roman Chancery. Pinet's edition contained some such clauses.

Your ground then would be to show that previous editions, containing those or similar clauses, did exist, and that they were genuine and authentic. In order to effect this, you endeavour, 1st, to fasten contradictions and inconsistencies upon me, in my examination of your witnesses,—2d, to uphold their credit, and 3d, to bring new evidence to sustain their position.

Now, sir, I shall proceed to examine your charges against my mode of showing that you have failed to prove the enactment of the statute. You say:—

"The sophistry about a license and a tax, you still introduce, I perceive, when nothing else can be said."

What is the proof of this?

"In your first letter, you admit that if you saw the editions of the tariff mentioned," viz., at Rome, 1514, at Cologne, 1515, at Paris, 1520, "it would prove that a penalty was inflicted, and so forth." Now, sir, I shall take the liberty of supplying what your *and so forth* refers to, and what I wrote; it is as follows, "upon the delinquent, after the commission of the crime, not that a license was previously granted." You also appear to have overlooked the following words which I wrote, and which I shall here give in *italics*, "suppose I did see such a book, and that it was what you describe,—*it would not sustain the truth of the charge of the memorial.*" I shall not charge garbling upon you, but I apprehend that the complexion of my whole sentence was thus changed by you; for I there asserted, as I still do, that the existence of the book, even were it what you describe, would not prove that such a statute as that mentioned in the memorial existed. I also stated in that letter that I did not know of any book which fixes a price for the absolution from any sin, according to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church; and after stating, that in the Roman Catholic Church an indulgence is not a license to commit sin, neither is it the mode of regulating the price at which sin may be committed, nor is it an absolution from sin already committed,—and therefore it was not what your memorial described.

You desire to show my inconsistencies thus: "But when I produce evidence the most satisfactory of the existence of these editions, you say I ought to produce the statute."

Now, sir, if you did produce such evidence, it would not show that I was inconsistent, because I previously said, whether correctly or not it is for others to judge, that such evidence would not prove the allegation of the memorial; and again, I would not be inconsistent, for I still say that you have produced no such evidence,—but that in saying that you have produced it, you only beg the question. This, too, is to be decided by our readers.

Again, you charge me with inconsistency because I will not touch "the notorious traffic of indulgences, and the legitimate and inevitable inference of a tariff." "And yet, I do not hesitate about an episode on Maria Monk, or unmeasured and most unnecessary allegations as to two absent clergymen." I have above shown why I would not touch indulgences, because their abuse was a different question from that of the existence of the alleged statute; and because, from their nature, they did not come under its description. The episodes were direct proofs

of the existence of a system of fiction and forgery to misrepresent our tenets and practices; and these proofs were intended to meet efforts such as I have often known to have been made, and which, in your last, you make to uphold Pinet, when you say that I venture to bring a charge of deliberate forgery against a literary gentleman of noble birth, and which I ought not to have brought without some proof. I thought I had brought some proof, and I did not therefore think them "most unnecessary," nor do I consider them "unmeasured." In the case of one of the clergymen, the author admitted that he fabricated the document,—and in the other, from my own personal examination, and from the most respectable testimony, I know the statements to be untrue.

It is not for me to judge of the value of my letters; it is for our readers, and to their judgment I commit them.

Your next charge upon me is, that I imputed to you, without foundation, the statement that Drelincourt was an Italian. Sir, I gave my authority; your own words were, that he was "a Roman priest." You ask me, "Does Roman Catholic mean Italian Catholic?" I answer, it may, because there are Roman Catholics who are Italians—and it may not, because there are Roman Catholics who are not Italians; but a "Roman priest" certainly means a priest of the Roman territory, which territory is certainly in Italy. You do not say that you wrote Roman Catholic, and if you did, the printer has made the omission, which misled me. And since I found you had so little knowledge as to give him to us as a Roman Catholic, which I inferred from your calling him a priest, an appellation which I believe Calvinistic clergymen disclaim, I thought you, perhaps, knew just as little of his country. Let this, sir, be my excuse in answer to your disclaimer.

You next ask me to translate the words of Bayle, where you assert that D'Aubigne quotes the book, and says, that of Paris, 1520, was the first. Sir, I am quite satisfied with your translation. It corresponds with the translation in the Charleston Library, to which I refer in making my statements. I was kindly invited by a mutual friend of ours in this city, to use in his library a French edition, to which, I believe, some friends of yours in this city also have access; but I generally use the translation made by English Protestants, and as it is open to all, I refer to it on this occasion. But let us see the charge made upon me, and how far it is sustained.

Your words are: "D'Aubigne also quotes the book, and I remarked that he cited the edition of 1520 as the first. You reply, 'he says no such thing.' Be pleased, sir, to translate the words of Bayle, (they are thus translated) Paris, 1520." Thus, you make it appear that I flip-

pantly deny, without any ground, what Bayle asserts as notorious fact.

My words were, "you tell us that D'Aubigne stated that the edition of Paris, in 1520, was the first. I beg leave to refer you to my letter of the 17th, where I show that D'Aubigne says no such thing, but that his note-maker said the edition of 1570 was the first; and another note-maker says, that was probably a mistake, and that 1520 was meant. This is no evidence of an edition of 1520 in Paris." Now, your quotation from Bayle is in his note upon Banck; and for his assertion that D'Aubigne cites the edition of Paris, 1520, he refers us to the article Pinet. Bayle's own words there are the following: "The commentator on the words *five gros* declares that this is found in folio 36, *verso*; he doubtless means that edition mentioned by D'Aubigne, viz., that of Paris, 1570," to which the following marginal note is attached: "a typographical error, probably for 1520."

My remarks, in my letter of the 17th, respecting D'Aubigne, are, "Between himself and his note-maker, we are told of a Paris edition of 1570, by Touissaint Denis. Another note-maker in Bayle states, that this must be a typographical error, and that it ought to have been probably 1520." I then state that the object of the correction was manifestly to heal a blunder, which I there describe. I leave to my readers now to decide between us.

You next insinuate that I have given a false translation in describing Banck's edition, "Sir, having given the French of *word for word* (*mot à mot*), which makes it appear as if you were translating closely, why did you not give the French for 'shown him as?' Bayle has no such word." My answer is, because I was not translating closely, nor translating loosely, but describing, as my context shows. The description, also, I still give as correct. I did not assert that Bayle stated it in the words I used, "shown as printed in Rome," but I described it so. And how else could I properly describe it? Dumont, who printed the book in 1664, showed the secretary a book bearing on its title, if you will, that it was printed in Rome one hundred and fifty years before. I described it "shown as printed in Rome." Now, sir, you must be aware, and if you are not, abundant proof could be furnished to show, that at this period it was by no means uncommon to issue books, whose title pages purported that they had been printed in a different place, and at a different time, from what was really the fact. Nor was this always done for the purpose of misleading the ordinary reader, but more frequently to escape the penalty of a prohibitory law, and to baffle the prosecutor. Nothing is better known to those who have studied the history of books. Hence, the title page was no evidence; and it was therefore

I described the book, "shown as printed at Rome." Bayle certainly has no such words, nor did I say he had. Neither does he directly assert that the work was printed at Rome. His words, as translated in the Charleston Library, are substantially yours.

"D'Aubigne's *Commentator* affirms, that the Paris edition of 1520 is the first; but I know that, in 1664, Stephen Dumont, a bookseller of Bois le Duc, published in Latin and Flemish, from an edition printed at Rome in 1514, a book entitled *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostolicæ, and Taxæ Sacræ Apostolicæ*; and that he collated, word for word, his edition with that of Rome, of which a certificate was given, printed in p. 131, by a secretary of Bois le Duc. It is said, in the preface in question, that this same work was printed at Colen. *Apud Gosvinum Colinium, in* 1515."

Now Bayle furnishes no proof that this was printed in Rome, in 1514, or at any time, nor that it was printed at Cologne, in 1515; but he says that he knows, what I do not deny or admit, that Dumont printed a book from an edition which bore upon its title page, if you will, or professed, in any other way that you please, that it was printed in Rome, in 1514. The secretary does not prove, nor assert its having been printed at Rome, but the conformity of the copy. In the article Banck, Bayle writes:—

"I have observed, likewise, that D'Aubigne quotes the edition of Paris, of 1520. That was not the first, as some have imagined; for the edition of Bois le Duc informs me that this book was printed at Rome, in 1514, and at Cologne, in 1515, and it was entitled *Regulæ, Constitutiones, Reservationes Cancellariæ, S. Domini nostri Leonis Papæ decimi, noviter editæ et publicatæ per Marcellum Silber, alias Franck, Romæ in Campo Floræ, anno MDXIV. die xviii. Novembris impressæ, finiunt feliciter.* This is what is testified by the two echevins of Bois le Duc, who, with the secretary of the city, had collated, word for word, this edition of Rome, with that which Stephen Dumont, bookseller, of Bois le Duc, published in the year 1664, and which is entitled *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apostoliciæ, et Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ.*"

Thus, Bayle has no proof but Dumont—and what is the bookseller's proof? I shall suppose he had a book purporting to have been printed at Rome in 1514. Where is the proof that this was then and there printed? The echevins of Bois le Duc, as Bayle calls them; the two clerks, as you call them. Surely you will not say that they have proved the book to have been printed at Rome one hundred and fifty years previously. You only inform us that Bayle says they aided the secretary in the collation, and that they deposed this, and that the col-

lation was word for word. This leaves us still without proof for an edition in Rome in 1514, or in Cologne in 1515. Was I then correct in describing the work which was used "as printed at Rome?" Can you say more for it than that it purported to have been printed there in 1514?

Now, sir, I have one word for you, and another for your clerks. You state that Bayle asserts that they "deposed," and to show that the deposition was an oath, you inform us, "and their affidavits also accompanied the work." Now, I can assure you, that in the edition in the Charleston Library, there is not a word which shows that they either made affidavits, or that their affidavits were published with the work. It only informs us that a certificate of the secretary was given, at page 131. I should be sorry to find that they had sworn, as I could not acquit them of perjury if they had: for when you compare even the two titles, you will find that they do not correspond word for word, because each has many words not to be found in the other. And, in truth, if they were both placed before an impartial judge, who knew nothing of the transaction, he would have no good cause to suspect they were descriptions of the same work. And yet, sir, I always believed that when books were certified to agree, word for word, the agreement extended to the titles. Now, sir, I respectfully ask, did you not strain at a gnat when you quarrelled with *as*? and did you not swallow a camel when you gulped the affidavits, and admitted the agreement, *mot a mot*, and concluded from such testimony that there was an edition printed in Rome in 1514, and one at Cologne in 1515, corresponding with that of Dumont in 1664?

I must unwillingly conclude here, for the present, by assuring you of the respect with which I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 31, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—I have now to explain a self-contradiction which you are pleased to charge upon me. You write:

"You first deny positively that Banck says he procured any copy of the *Tax-book* in Rome." To sustain this you quote my words: "Banck never made any such assertion."—(letter 1). You proceed: "Then in the face of this you affirm that he does profess not only to

have procured, but brought away a printed copy, in 1644." To sustain this you quote my words: "The copy Banck brought from Rome was in 1644." (letter 2). This really looks like a contradiction; I must acknowledge that it does.

But, sir, the only explanation I can offer is, that when all my words are quoted, they have a very different meaning from what a few of them, separated from the rest, will bear. I shall give my words, as they are found in letter 1st. They are as follows: "Your ninth witness is Banck; you say," here I quote your words, "he procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book,* and published it." "I apprehend that here you have made another mistake, and that Banck never made any such assertion." Now, sir, the assertion which I say that Banck did not make, was that which you said he made; and your own words are, (letter of August 31,) "He procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Chancery, and published it!" My denial, then, was not of his having procured an edition in Rome, but of his having published the edition so procured; and my next words make this so plain as to allow no subterfuge: "His statement was that he had a number of copies differing in a variety of points from each other, not in difference of coins, but difference of crimes, and difference of rates for the same crimes, and that out of the whole he gave a new compilation, supplying in each what was wanting in the other. Thus it was not an exact copy of any preceding one." This was what I wrote, and it was plainly denying that the book which Banck published was by him stated to be what you describe it was, "a publication of the famous *Tax-book* of the Chancery which he procured in Rome," but alleging that it was a compilation of his own. Then, sir, I did not deny that he procured and brought from Rome any edition of the Chancery *Tax-book*; and, therefore, if I asserted that he did bring such a copy, I did not contradict myself.

We now come to the statement in my second letter, and there the passage is the following:

"Banck says that amongst the copies which he consulted, and from which he made his selection, were an edition of Cologne in 1523, and one of Wittenberg in 1558, not 1538, as you state (and though you have not noticed it, I was wrong here, for upon again looking to the article, I find you give it correctly,) and an Italian tract, with the tax under Innocent X., which should not have been earlier than 1644—(because it was in that year Innocent X. became Pope, and upon each accession no tax can be legally demanded until ratified by the new pontiff,) you state that 'he procured in Rome an edition of that famous *Tax-book* of

the Chancery, and published it.' The edition published by Banck was in 1651—the copy he brought from Rome was in 1644."

Now all this was predicated upon your own assertion, the truth of which I denied. You asserted that he "published it." To what does it refer? Clearly to the "edition of the famous *Tax-book*," which "he procured in Rome." He published it, not at Rome, but at Francker. He must have had a copy from which the publication was made, and clearly that must have been brought from Rome. This, sir, was the process by which I was led to assert that, upon the supposition of your being correct in stating that if he procured a copy of the *Tax-book* in Rome, and published it at Francker, he must have brought the copy from Rome. Now, sir, so far from admitting the truth of your assertion, I denied it; (I did so letter 1st.) "You say he procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Chancery, and published it; I apprehend, sir, that here you have made another mistake, and that Banck never made any such assertion." I argued in the following manner, (letter second,) to show the absurdity of your statement: "The edition published by Banck was in 1651; the copy he brought from Rome was in 1644, and it was upon the index of prohibited books in 1570, exactly seventy-four years previous to this date; and the preface to Banck's book informs us that it was placed upon the index in 1570, because in Rome they were ashamed of it, and sought to stifle it, and yet they printed and published it, and allowed their enemy to bring away a copy, and publish it to their degradation!!!" You are quite correct in what you add, "and then quote Banck himself to show that the book was on the index of prohibited works in 1570, and exclaim with no less than three triumphant!!! at the absurdity. Is this right?" This leads me to see that you perceived what I intended to be the drift of my observations, which was to exhibit the absurdity of your assertion, "He procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery, and published it." I apprehend, then, that on my part there is no self-contradiction. I leave to the reader to form his own opinion of your production and of mine.

As I have been thus forced to the re-examination of Banck, it will be as well to dispose, in this place, of all that you urge to sustain him. You add: "Banck does say he procured and availed himself of a copy in Rome, but it was a private manuscript copy, shown him by the lecturer as above, being as I said before, the private copy of that monk. He says nothing about 'bringing away any copy from Rome,' much less a printed one in 1644." Now, sir, were I to take this assertion of years as a ground upon which I could rely, I would desire nothing more

to effect the complete destruction of your original assertion—"He procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery and published it." If he took no copy which he brought away, how could he publish it? He may publish his recollection of it; but would his recollection of a private manuscript copy, the private copy of a monk, printed after he had made a journey from Rome to Francker, be admitted as authority in any impeachment? Are the Pope and the officers of the Roman Chancery accountable for the contents of a private manuscript, the private property of a monk, which in all probability had never been seen by either of them, even admitting the existence of such a monk and such a copy, and the accuracy of the recollection of such witness? You seem, however, to think him an excellent witness:

"He was a distinguished Swede. . . He spent some time in Rome, and returned with great honour to his own country, and died in 1662. He procured in Rome an edition of the famous *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery, and published it." "He travelled in Italy, and Spain, and France, and was a 'scholar' and 'professor of jurisprudence,' and was 'honoured with distinguished appointments.' 'Here, then, is a man possessing every qualification and facility, and he declares that to make his work complete he consulted the most ancient editions of the *Tax-book*, and compared them word for word; and that he used the edition of Cologne, 1523, and Wittenburg, 1538. He also examined a manuscript copy, shown him by Sibon, a Bernard monk and lecturer in the College of Rome;' of what dates he does not say, but it was 'a manuscript,' and as the lecturer only let him have a sight of it (*communique*), I presume that it was the tariff then used, but which it was no longer safe to reprint, indeed the printing of which was prohibited. How do you get rid of Banck? With the other witnesses, you simply affirm, 'they prove nothing, are declaimers,' and so forth; of this one you undertake to impeach the testimony by argument, and what do you urge? 1st. Banck's work 'was not a document for which any tribunal was accountable,' that is to say, if a distinguished lawyer should collect carefully and publish correctly all the acts of the legislature, on any subject, and give a complete and full edition, he would publish statutes for which the legislature was not accountable."

Now I shall try your remarks by Bayle's testimony, taken from his notes on Banck as found in the library. 1st. Bayle states that Banck "says that he consulted the most ancient copies, printed or manuscript." He enumerates those which he used, viz.: the edition of Cologne, 1523; that of Wittenburg, 1538; that of Venice, 1584; and the manuscript of Sibon, which you state he had not, for he only "had a sight of it in

Rome," and he added notes and a glossary, and an Italian tract which contained the tax under Innocent X., who became Pope in 1644, and was at the head of the church in 1651, when Banck's book was published. Thus he saw one manuscript and had three printed copies, not one of which was either official or proved to conform to an official or authentic copy. Bayle subsequently mentions editions, Rome, 1514; Cologne, 1515; Paris, 1520; Venice, 1533; Paris, 1545; Venice, 1584; Frankfort, 1612; and Paris, 1625, and remarks, "Our Laurence Banck knew nothing" of almost all of these editions. I am quite convinced that of almost all of them the very persons who were said to have printed them knew nothing. This will show the extent of his research; as that of Venice, 1584, was in Banck's enumeration, we suppose he knew nothing of the other seven.

Before I stated that Banck's was a document for which no tribunal was accountable, I gave the reasons. 1st. That his compilation was not an exact copy of any preceding one. 2d. That the documents which he says he used, differed from each other. 3d. That he supplied from each what was wanting in the others. 4th. That though he gave it as an edition (and of course purporting to be a copy) of the *Tax-book*, it was a compilation of his own, for which he alone was accountable. I admit that if any tribunal subsequently recognised its correctness, that tribunal would then be accountable; but the tribunal which you endeavour to make responsible for it, concurred with that which denounced it. Bayle's words are: "And by comparing them word for word, supplied by means of one what was wanting in the others."

Now for your comparison of his work with that of a compilation of all the laws upon any subject. 1st. You beg the question, because Catholics denied that what he collected were laws. Bayle says that Pinet, Voetius, and Hottinger "opposed that [the Paris edition of 1550,] chiefly to the Roman Catholics, who would never allow that the tax of the Chancery was ever published with privilege, and next, because by placing it on the Index the proper Roman tribunal denounced it as no law.

"Collect carefully all the laws." The care with which he collected, may be seen from your own statement; he brought no copy from Rome, though he printed according to Bayle, a copy of the tax which was made use of under Pope Innocent X.,—that is, after 1644; that he knew nothing of most of eight editions which Bayle enumerates, and he makes no mention, in describing those that he used, of Pinet's in 1564,—"and publish correctly." How can such a compilation as this be called a correct publication, when he himself states that he followed no edition,

but made a compilation from all? This is not noting the variations which successive legislatures may make in the laws upon any subject, and giving after their exhibition the exact law then in force; but it is combining into one mass all the statements of documents which purport to be copies of one instrument and which do not in fact agree. This is not a correct publication, according to my view; I will not say but in your estimation it may be correct.

Should an American lawyer of eminence make such a compilation as you describe, of the laws of any state upon a given subject, it would be a fair representation of the law and the legislature would be accountable therefor. Would the legislature of this state be accountable for a compilation made by a foreign lawyer, in order to bring the state and its legislature into contempt, though this compilation should purport to be an exhibition of its laws upon any subject, whilst the tribunals of the state openly denounced the works from which the compilation was said to be made, as depraved by hostile opponents? Banck was a hostile opponent to Rome; his compilation was made to bring its tribunals into contempt; the works which he said he used, if they existed at all, were openly denounced by the Roman tribunals, as depraved by hostile opponents! Thus, sir, I submit that I have sustained my assertion, "Banck's was not a document for which any tribunal was accountable."

I have then done with him, unless you should again put him forward. It is not my prerogative to force your assent; but it is my duty to show why I made the assertion, and it is for every reader to form his own opinion of the sufficiency of my reasons.

But, sir, I have a word or two for what you "presumed." You presume that Sibon's manuscript "was the tariff then used, but which it was no longer safe to print, indeed the printing of which was prohibited." I should suppose it would be equally unsafe to let an enemy get a sight of it in manuscript as in print, and that Sibon was then unsafe for having shown it, should he be convicted. He conferred a favour on Banck, by "giving the sight;" and his friend Banck, in return, published to the world, and of course to the Roman authorities, that Sibon, a lecturer in their college, betrayed them! ! ! You observe, I consider this to be so absurd, that I again use what you call my notes of triumph, but what I only intend for the admiration of astonishment. No, sir, it was not unsafe to print the genuine copy of the work of the Chancery, though I grant it would not be very safe to print an edition depraved or corrupted, and it was only the printing of such editions that was prohibited. In fact, the book containing the regula-

tions of the Roman Chancery was continually printed and reprinted in Rome, from the discovery of the art of printing to the present day. Dr. Lingard writes, (*Tracts* published by Lucas, Baltimore, note, p. 115,) "I have, however, read the *Regulæ Cancellariæ*, printed 1481, and several other editions from that period to the close of the last century." They are reprinted at Rome, generally upon the accession of each new Pope. I have now before me a copy in the *Jus Canonicum* of Reiffensteal. The copy was published by the authority and direction of Pope Clement XI., and certified by the proper officer, Joseph Maria Minicoti, the deputy guardian of the Chancery. The document itself is contained in fourteen folio pages. Several decisions and solutions of questions arising from its contents, occupy nearly eight folio pages. I shall freely show it to any who thinks proper to consult it. I beg leave to copy your own remark, which our readers will apply as they see fit. "These sorts of arguments are dangerous; they are almost always sure to explode in the hands of the person who uses them."

You correct my reference to Dr. Robertson's authorities, and you say that, besides referring to Bayle, and the Frankfort edition of the *Tax-book*, he also refers to the Fasciculus and to Schelhorn. I admit the correctness of your description of his notes of reference; but they are for his entire paragraph, which contains many other statements besides the description of the Tax-book—and I apprehend you will find that the two which I omitted, are to sustain his other statements, and have no concern with that book. It is possible that this may, on my part, be a mistake. I, however, have some reason to think otherwise. Should you prove that I am in error, I shall be glad to be corrected, but it will not give Robertson one particle of additional strength. What would my argument gain, for instance, were I to prove that Dr. Robertson confounded Francker in the Netherlands, with Franckfort in Germany?

I have done with Saurin, with Robertson, with Buck, the Encyclopedia, with Dumont, with his secretary, with his clerks, with their affidavits, and with D'Aubigne and his note-maker's typographical error, and I have done with Banck.

You say that Drelincourt, who, as Bayle tells you, was a Protestant minister, "proves everything," in answer to my allegation that he "proved nothing." If you take his word for proof, which I am not disposed to do upon such a question, and under such circumstances, he proves that there was an edition of Paris in 1520, which contained the wicked clauses, because he said that he had it. Dumont said that he had an edition of Rome in 1514; he did not prove it. But Drelin-

court told the Bishop of Belley that he had it; and you ask, "does the Bishop deny this?" I must avow that I do not know, for I have not seen the Bishop's answer, nor do I know whether he made any answer, but I do know that you will find in Bayle's note on Banck, the testimony of Gisbert Voet, a Protestant minister, that the Catholics denied its existence, *Addo rem et librum a Pontificiis passim negari ubi, ita usu venit ut nostri allegando illam taxam mendacii et calumnæ suspecti sunt.* He had been writing of the *Tax-book* which he calls *Penitentiariæ,* not of the Roman "Chancery," and he says that very few copies remain of the Paris quarto edition of 1520. It is easy, he adds, to conjecture who destroyed them, and he begs that they who have copies may be very careful to keep them.

"I add, that the thing and the book are everywhere denied by the Papists, whence it has become usual that our people are suspected of lying and calumny in alleging that tax." I could add other witnesses. Thus, if the existence of the book was alleged by some few, it was "everywhere denied by the Papists." Drelincourt was born, as I before observed, in 1595: that is, the book is said to have been printed seventy-five years before his birth, and he is called upon to prove when and where it was printed; because, upon the strongest ground of his case, and believing all that he says to be true, he had a book which purported to have been then and there printed. You may call this proof; I do not. Voet, who was at least six years his senior, tells us that the Papists everywhere denied that there was such an edition; and I believe it is in human nature, that when a large body are fully aware that notorious fabrication is adduced, to charge against them gross misconduct of which they are not guilty, a general denial, everywhere made, is all that can be expected, and that every repetition of the calumny is not met by a formal and written recorded denial.

You adduce Drelincourt and D'Aubigne, as your witnesses for the Paris edition of 1520. I have done with the latter. I now repeat the former proves nothing, for though he might have had a book, purporting to have been printed in Paris in that year, there is nothing to show that it was then and there printed. It might have been printed after 1564, and dated 1520, and still be thirty years old when Drelincourt was born. Thus it is not necessary to impeach his credit to destroy his testimony. The same remarks may be applied to his book of 1545. I am done with Drelincourt and his testimony.

You ask me, "and of what avail is it to say that the edition of 1520 was not of Rome?" I suspect, sir, had you detected such a saying on my part, you would make it avail for more than I have done. "You

know that an edition of Paris in 1520 could not be the work of Protestants." Perhaps not. But you know that an edition as of Paris and as of 1520 could.

I regret that neither my matter nor my occupation will permit me to conclude as speedily as we would both desire.

I have the honour, reverend, sir, to be

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 2, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller.

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—Your next topic before me is Pinet. You endeavour to sustain him in a variety of ways, and clearly it was important that you should. You first lecture me roundly for imputing to him the "heinous and infamous crime of forgery." That he was the original fabricator, was my opinion, and I still entertain it, your lecture notwithstanding. You ask, "Does any single biographer or writer bring this charge against him?" Suppose no one did, and that my reasons would lead to the conclusion, would the silence of others destroy their value? I am content to rest upon them for the support of that opinion. But I shall give you one writer, which will be sufficient to meet your question with a "yes." Dr. Lingard (p. 114 *Tracts*) writes:—

"It is indeed true, that for the transaction of business in the Papal Chancery, as well as in the ecclesiastical courts in England, fees have been required by the officers; but these are not paid as the price of sin, but for the expedition of business. This circumstance, however, furnished a useful hint to some of the fathers of the Reformation, who had no objection to a pious fraud, when it might promote the godly work in which they were engaged. The *Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ* were ingeniously corrected, interpolated, and enlarged; the improved copy was circulated by the Reformers, as a proof that Rome was the great custom-house of sin, and the cheat was greedily devoured by the prejudices of their disciples. He says in his note: "The principal editions of the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ*, are those given by Pinet and Banck, and both were censured as spurious at Rome and Madrid."

The insertion upon the index *depravata* is a charge of forgery by a public tribunal.

You tell me that I offer no direct testimony! I answer that I give that sort of testimony which is generally found sufficient, and generally

the only kind which can be adduced in such a case. 1. That he edited and published a book containing the fabricated matter. 2. That as soon as could be reasonably expected, the competent public tribunal denounced it as a fabrication. 3. That there is no evidence of its having been previously published or known. 4. That the Catholics everywhere protested against the fabrication, and charged with lying and calumny those who imputed to them the crimes charged in the fabrication. 5. That Pinet does not exhibit his original, nor refer to it, nor describe it, so that it could be identified. 6. That he was a virulent enemy of those whom the publication vilifies; and 7. That he published several other fictions as true history. I should tremble for myself if I were arraigned before your reverend friends in this city, upon a charge of forgery against a Protestant church of any denomination, and that you were to conduct the prosecution, and had such a case to make out against me. Something perhaps remains to be said on the third of these heads.

You say Bayle asserts the existence of former editions. I never denied that he made the assertion: but I think I showed that it was unsustained by evidence, and I shall show that it is not upheld by your new witnesses. Lingard says (*Tracts*, note pp. 114, 115):

"Bayle (and I believe it is to Bayle either mediately or immediately, the most of our adversaries are indebted for the knowledge which they display on this important subject) observes that it is difficult to explain the great differences between these two editions, (Pinet's and Banck's,) to understand the real value of the moneys they mention. He adds that there are also several editions given at Paris and Cologne; but he, it appears, was never able to meet any of them; I have been equally unfortunate."

Bayle, then, has no testimony of his own upon the subject; he reasons, if you will, upon the testimony of other witnesses; we have that testimony; our business is with that, not with him.

You say that upon a bibliographical point, to which special pleading has degraded this discussion, he is acknowledged authority all over Europe. Sir, I never was aware of any other discussion than that to ascertain whether the Roman Chancery had passed the statute to which you alluded. You undertook to prove it by producing the book, and the discussion naturally became a question of bibliography, viz.: were there such books as you alleged? Were they authentic? Do they give evidence that the Roman Chancery enacted the statute? You may wish to rove more at large; but I cannot consent to go out of the evidence. I have nothing to do with Bayle until he gives some testimony which

would affect the case. He has given none—he is a reasoner, not a witness. Sir, it is a common assertion with gentleman in your position, that infidels are impartial between Catholics and Protestants. I am far from admitting the truth of this. It has been frequently observed that uniformly they aid the latter against the former, and for a very natural reason. Their object is to destroy Christianity; should they succeed in bringing the larger portion of the Christian body into contempt, the victory over the smaller would be greatly facilitated. It would require but a farther application of the principle by which the infidel would overturn the Catholic, to demolish the Protestant. Hence the efforts of Gibbon, Hume, Voltaire, Rosseau, and all that school are carefully directed against Catholics. Besides, Bayle had special hatred to Catholics, because of the exile which he suffered under the laws of France for returning to the profession of Protestantism. These are my objections to placing myself under his authority.

Now, sir, you tell me there is full proof of an edition long before Pinet's. This is really the proper question. Your first witness is Abbe Richard. You say that "he admits the tariff of sin in 1320." I know nothing of him, but what Bayle relates in his notes on Banck. You probably know something more, for you inform me that Jurieu preached in Paris, as I apprehend your expressions; I was not before aware of this. However, as I like to have your own words under my eye, I copy them here.

"Abbe Richard, in Bayle's time, and in Paris, where certainly the matter could have been settled, when Jurieu preached against the abominations of the *Tax-book*, and produced an ancient copy, did not for a moment attempt to say it was a forgery; but admits the guilt of the Chancery, and informs us when that Court commenced to issue the tariffs for sin, viz., 1320, and rests his whole defence on denying that the Church could be held responsible for the acts of the Chancery."

Now, suppose I grant the whole of this to be true. I do not know that it will prove more than that Abbe Richard, whoever he was, made a mistake. Jurieu died in 1713, at which period a copy of Pinet's edition would have been one hundred and forty-nine years old. You would call a book printed in 1713 an ancient copy, and yet it would not be more than one hundred and twenty-six years old. It was long previous to this upon the Index at Rome, at Madrid and in Paris, as a forgery, *depravata*. One hundred years previous to this, we have evidence that the Catholics everywhere denied the truth of the charge, and that it was usual to suspect as liars and calumniators those who alleged that there was such a tax. And yet the good Abbe had nothing

to say to Jurieu, only that it was as old as 1320, but the church was not accountable for it! ! ! Should I make you a present of the Abbe you would gain nothing by it.

But from the extract which Bayle furnishes, it would seem that the question between them was whether the whole church was not criminal, because the *Tax-book* of the Chancery contained iniquitous items, and that Richard answered no: the church is only accountable for its laws and its canons, but the book of Chancery taxes not being a law or a canon of the church, she is not accountable therefor. He next states that the taxes of the Chancery did not begin until 1320, and the taxes of the penitentiary did not appear until 1336, and that both were immediately suppressed. Now this is untrue, for the regular taxes always subsisted, and are still payable for documents procured from either office. Thus, if it were asserted by Richard, he stated what was not the fact: but if, by either design or accident, by typographical error or otherwise, a few words of what Richard did write happened to fall out, and these words described that there were interpolated editions at a later period, and that they were suppressed and put amongst the prohibited works, he would have stated what was a notorious fact. The following is the extract of Bayle, and I know nothing farther of Abbe Richard, who, notwithstanding my ignorance, might have been a very great man.

"The abbot replies, that these were only "particular facts," which had never been "authorized by the laws and canons of the Church of Rome." "We take it well," continues he, "that M. Jurieu gives an account of the taxes from an old book of Chancery of Rome. But is it not extremely ridiculous to make a book of taxes pass for the laws and canons of the church? Would it not turn the civil law into a mere fable, to insert the fees of executioners into the code and place them amongst the laws? Would not this do a great honour to the gentlemen concerned? Let M. Jurieu learn then what the laws and canons of the Church of Rome are: and let him know in the mean time that these old taxes of the Chancery of Rome are not only of no authority in the church, but that she has always abhorred them. These taxes of the Chancery did not begin till under the pontificate of John XXII., about the year 1320: and the taxes of the penitentiary did not appear till towards the year 1336, under Benedict XII.; and both of them were immediately suppressed, and afterwards ranked amongst the prohibited books, according to the observation of the Sieur Dumont, who published them in 1664: which shows sufficiently the abhorrence which the Church of Rome had for those taxes; so far was she from proposing or holding them as rules as M. Jurieu would make us believe. Let

him know, then, that the actions of the officers of the Court of Rome are only the action of particular men and not of the church."

Thus we have no proof that Jurieu's copy preceded 1664, and Richard proves no copy at all, nor does he tell us what the taxes were in 1320, or at any other period. Thus Abbe Richard, though he admits as I do a tariff, in 1320, does not prove your statute, nor your tariff, nor the tariff of sin.

You then tell us that Dumont, and two clerks, and the Secretary of Bois le Duc establish that of Rome in 1514, and that of Cologne in 1515. I doubt much if our readers will admit that of Rome as proved by them, your imaginary affidavits notwithstanding—and this grouping of witnesses and facts appears to have perplexed even your clear understanding, for you must recollect that neither the secretary nor clerks said or swore one word respecting that of Cologne. The preface of the bookseller is all that we have for that. And as to the effort to clothe with the semblance of official authority this transaction concerning the Roman edition, I would ask any plain man, of how much value would be the testimony of the corporation of Beaufort that they had compared word for word, and found a perfect agreement between the copy of an act passed by the Parliament of Paris, in 1689, and a copy of it printed in Beaufort this year, unless they had unquestionable proof that the copy said to have been printed at Paris was really an exact copy of the act? Thus there is no proof for the alleged editions of Rome or of Cologne.

"Drelincourt and D'Aubigne prove that of Paris of 1520." I must leave it to our readers to determine for themselves. I say neither of them does. Nor is there any proof for it. The Catholics everywhere denied it. D'Aubigne gives us by his commentator 1570. Bayle tells us it was a typographical error, probably for 1520. This edition is not proved.

"Banck proves that of Cologne in 1535." If Banck's word be proof, we may believe that in 1651, that is, one hundred and sixteen years after that period, and eighty-seven years after Pinet's edition, he had a book purporting to have been printed then and there; I am not disposed to receive his word as evidence, and even if I were so disposed, his testimony comes a century too late.

"Drelincourt proves that of Paris, 1545." Just as well as he proves that of 1520, which is not at all.

We have now a new witness and of portentous aspect: "1546 is the date of the Council of Trent, and the protest of the Protestant princes: and in their protest they insert a copy of the tariff." (This

Bayle supposes to be the copy which Pinet followed, as "they agree precisely.")

Sir, in cases of this description, accuracy of dates is very necessary, and however little it may be satisfactory, to either of us, I must "consent to follow you into these sorts of criticism," for though they do consume time, they do contribute everything to truth; and though my occupations are such as to leave me little time, and to expose me to perpetual distraction and successive interruptions, I must endeavor to get through your statement as well as I can.

In the present instance I was astonished at your inaccuracy. It is true that 1546 is the date of opening the Council of Trent, but it is not the date of the protest; nor do the princes insert a copy of the tariff in their protest. Bayle himself tells you they presented their grievances in the Assembly of Naumburg, where Pius IV. and Ferdinand (then Emperor) exhorted them to be present at the Council of Trent, by themselves or their deputies. Pius IV. became Pope in 1559, that is, thirteen years after you say they made the protest against accepting his invitation. Though Charles V. abdicated in 1556, yet the princes of Germany not having accepted the abdication until 1558, Ferdinand was not until then received by them as emperor. Pope Paul IV., refused to recognise him, and Rome acknowledged him only after the accession of Pius IV., in the next year. In 1560, the Pope published, on the third Kalends December, Nov. 29,) the bull for reassembling the council of Trent. A great number of the leading Protestants of Germany, seeing a copy of the document, and having met at the marriage of the Duke of Lunenburg, resolved to hold a diet at Naumburg in Saxony on the 29th of January, 1561.

The Pope had sent two legates, Commendon, Bishop of Zante, and Delfino, Bishop of Pharo in Dalmatia, into Germany to extend the invitation. After having seen the emperor, at his request, they went, accompanied by Otho, Count of Eberstein, Felix Bogislas, Baron Assenstein, and William Meela, keeper of the seals of the kingdom of Bohemia, as ambassadors from the emperor, to request the princes who were to assemble at Naumburg, to attend the council. Leaving Vienna on the 4th of January, they did not arrive at Naumburg until the 28th. They found the Protestant princes, with the exceptions of John Frederic, Duke of Saxe-Weimar, assembled. After some delay the legates were coldly admitted to address the Diet on the 4th of February. The ambassadors of Frederic had been previously officially informed by the princes, as Fra Paolo states: That they thanked the emperor for his invitation: that the princes would not refuse to send representa-

tives to a council in which the word of God should be the judge, in which the bishops should be released from their oaths of fidelity to the Pope, and in which Protestant divines should be entitled to vote: but that as the Pope admitted into his council only bishops who had taken this oath, against which the princes had always protested, they believed it would be very difficult to accede to the emperor's request. They begged that this might be respectfully communicated to the emperor, but that they would defer a final answer until they would have communicated with their absent friends. The legates had left their briefs with the Diet, and they had not arrived at their lodgings more than a quarter of an hour, when messengers from the assembly came to return the documents with the seals unbroken, stating that during the presence of the legates, the envelope had not been removed; but when it was, the princes found that the Pope addressed them as "his dear sons;" which relation they disclaimed, as also his right to call a council. Fleury and Fra Paolo are here a little at variance: the first says, "in a quarter of an hour;" the latter says, "next day." Courayer corrects Fra Paolo in the next statement; that the Diet invited the legates to return for their answer, and agrees with Fleury, who informs us that on the 7th the princes sent a deputation to inform them, that they recognised in the Pope no jurisdiction, and had no need of giving him any explanations for not attending his council. Fleury details the discourses between the legates and the commissioners, in which mention is made of much superstition and corruption, but not one word of the *Tax-book*, at this period, fifteen years after the date which you assign, and three years before Pinet's edition appeared.

Now had you proved that at this period the German Protestant princes published an edition of the *Tax-book*, what would be the consequence? You would have proved to me that my opinion of Pinet was incorrect, because you would have removed the imputation from him and fixed it upon the princes, who would then be chargeable with the fraud, unless we had evidence not yet furnished that they copied it from an authentic document.

But, sir, you must be aware of another difficulty which you would have to remove. You would have to show the world that this assembly at Naumburg of Lutheran princes, with their councillors and divines, should be relied upon as good witnesses of what was an authentic document of the Roman Chancery in, we will say, 1514, when they were incompetent to satisfy themselves which of four copies of the confession of their own faith, differing from each other, was the authentic original, presented at Augsburg, to Charles V. in 1530.

I quote Fra Paolo in preference to the other authors, except where I especially mention others; and you or any of my readers can refer to his history of the Council of Trent to examine the truth of my statements, as the haste in which I write, and other duties which press upon me, as well as the desire of brevity, prevent my making special and precise extracts. Upon the crowning of Maximilian at Frankfort, on the 30th November, 1562, the Protestant princes presented in a body the reasons why they called for what they styled a free council, and the conditions which they required, and upon which they would consent to attend. They were, 1st. That it should be held in Germany. 2d. That it should not be called by the Pope. 3d. That he should not preside, but have his place like other members, and be subject to its decree. 4th. That the bishops and other prelates should be free from their oaths. 5th. That the Holy Scripture, without any human authority, should be the judge of this assembly. 6th. That the theologians of the Confession of Augsburg should not only have the right of debate, but of deliberation and vote; and that they should have safe-guard for their person and the exercise of their religion. 7th. That the decisions of the council should not be made as in lay-assemblies by the majority of votes, but by the better opinions, though of the minority; that is, the most comformable to the word of God. 8th. That all which had been hitherto done at Trent should be regarded as null and void; this assembly having been partial, celebrated only by one of the parties, and not conducted as had been promised. 9th. That if the council could not terminate the religious differences, there should be an inviolable adherence to the conditions agreed upon at Passau, and the religious peace established at Augsburg in 1555, and that all should be obliged to its observance: and 10th. That for all the above conditions a full and complete guaranty should be given.

Fleury (Year 1562, Liv. clxii. N. 54), gives from Sponde the reasons upon which this protest was founded. The sixth charges Rome with vices and crimes, and, therefore, she ought not to be allowed a judicial place. The seventh charges Rome with simony and the sale of everything sacred. Thus, though the charges which had been repeated from the beginning were again brought forward, we have no mention of a *Tax-book* in this act of theirs.

The ambassadors of the emperor urge upon the council a variety of topics to meet his wishes for their conciliation; the discourses and memoirs are found in the acts of the council by Labbe, and in a collection of the authentic documents of the council, in 7 volumes quarto, which have been placed in the library of the Seminary by the Hon. H.

S. Legare,—and in no one of these is there any allusion to their having mentioned the book, though they exhibit their declarations and protests against the venality and simony of Rome.

Bayle informs us, that at Frankfort they appointed divines and political counsellors to draw up a book to justify their acts, their protest, and their refusal to attend. Fleury informs us, that this book was subsequently printed at Frankfort. The committee was not appointed until the end of 1562, or the beginning of 1563; and at this period, we have no evidence of the existence of an edition of the *Tax-book*, nor of the *Statute of the Chancery*. Now, even if this book, drawn up by the committee, should contain either the copy of an edition of the *Tax-book*, or items of the tax, it would be no evidence that the protest of the princes contained either, because the book was not the protest, but was, as Bayle calls it, "a book in which these grievances were enlarged, explained, and defended." Bayle informs us that Tuppius translated into Latin a German book, which the princes of the *Augsburg Confession* had composed, in order to justify themselves for not submitting to the Council of Trent. The epistle dedicatory of this Latin version is dated at Strasbourg, March 31, 1565,—that is, more than year after Pinet's edition had been published at Lyons; and we have no evidence to show that the German had been as yet printed, for he is stated to have translated, not a book "published," but a book "composed."

And though reference is had to the authorities upon which its statements rest, as will be seen in Tuppius's advertisement, "Scripture, writings of the Fathers, the Commentaries of school Divines, Canonists and other writers,"—not one word is said of a copy of the Chancery *Tax-book*, though it would have been the most important document of all. The following is the translation of the advertisement, afterwards the title.

"These grievances in defence of the pure and orthodox religion, were first proposed in the assembly of the princes at Naumburg, then repeated and offered to the emperor in the public Diet of the Empire, held at Frankfort, for the election and coronation of the King of the Romans; and at last, at the command of some of the states of the empire, are illustrated by several divines and political counsellors appointed for that purpose, with a fuller explication of each head, from the testimonies of Scripture, the writings of the fathers, the commentaries of school divines, canonists, and other writers, collected long ago to that end with singular diligence, and contained in this book, which may be continued

down to posterity as a monument of the zeal of these states for religion and the republic."

Title of the book. "The grievances opposed to the restoration and continuation of the Council of Trent, appointed by Pope Pius IV. in 1562, and to the decrees of the said council; in which grievances are represented the necessary and weighty reasons why the electors, princes, and states of the empire, who embrace the *Augsburgh Confession*, would neither own, nor be present at that council."

Bayle himself complains of one charge against Leo X., for which no authority is cited, and remarks: "It is a little strange that no authority should be cited for it; and that in a book of this nature, facts should be advanced which are known only from vague reports."

He tells us that "The observations on the tax of the apostolical chamber have not been spared, and are concluded with a long detail of the articles of that tax." Bayle does not, however, refer for them to the edition of 1565,—if an edition appeared even so early, which I must doubt,—but to pages 79 and 89 of the edition of 1597; that is, thirty-three years after Pinet's work was published.

Bayle does not say that it quotes any edition, or purports to be a copy of any edition of the *Tax-book*; but he says, "This detail might pass for an edition of the *Taxæ Sacræ Penitentiariæ*; and it is upon this foot Hunnius gives it, by inserting it in the preface to his book *De Indulgentiis*, printed at Frankfort in 1599, in octavo.

After this, you will not expect me to admit the truth of your statement: "1546 is the date of the Council of Trent, and of the protest of the princes, and in it they inserted a copy of the tariff." Now, as the first proved notice of the articles we have was published in 1597, it is much more natural to suppose that the publishers copied the edition of Pinet, published thirty-three years previously, than that the said Lord of Norroy copied what was published thirty-three years after he wrote!

Bayle himself admits that it was not "a copy of the tariff," as you call it, when he writes this detail might pass for a copy of the *Taxæ Sacræ Penitentiariæ.*

Bayle says, "I had conjectured that Du Pinet had followed the edition inserted in the book of the Protestant princes of Germany. This conjecture is well founded, as I have verified since." We shall see the grounds of that conjecture.

In his article on Banck, after quoting an extract from Pinet, he observes: "I imagine that Du Pinet followed the edition which the Protestant princes caused to be inserted in their causes for rejecting

the Council of Trent, and which is entitled *Taxæ Sacræ Penitentiariæ.*" We have before seen that, instead of calling it "an edition," he tells us that it was a detail which "might pass for an edition;" and he next refers us to Heiddegar, who was not born until 1633, showing that he gave some extracts from the Frankfort detail, which are exactly like the work of Pinet, as if it were difficult to find a similarity between what was framed in 1564, and [that which] could have been copied from it and published in 1597, or in 1565, if you prefer it. And next he tells us that some persons observe that "the epitome of the tax of the Chancery is to be found in p. 603," of another work explaining the reasons of the Protestant princes. I have no doubt of it, but what does it prove? Or if he brought fifty others, such epitomes are no proof of an edition previous to Pinet's; Bayle gives us no other reason for his assertion that Pinet copied the edition alleged to have been given by the princes, and in these statements we find only an agreement—but no evidence of this addition to the protest of the Protestant princes having existed until after 1664. But suppose that, against all that I have adduced, they did both appear in 1664. Frankfort and Lyons were not so distant, nor Pinet and the committee such strangers, as not to have been capable of acting in concert, and then they must share the disgrace between them; or even if you had proved that their publication preceded his, you would only have transferred the whole burden from his shoulders to theirs—and I should have called them, not him, the fabricators. Theirs is said to be the tax of the Penitentiary, his of the Chancery; his was published early in 1664. We have no evidence of the tariff upon the book of their committee previous to 1597, which is fifty-six years later than the date you gave. Now, sir, I have done with the Protestant princes. You have no proof from them to save the Lord of Norroy.

As to Banck's proving an edition of Wirtemberg, in 1558, I apprehend you have been misled by my mistake, which I corrected in my last letter. He has proved no such edition.

I come now to your last witness.

"About 1555, Claude D'Espence flourished, and he admits the *Tax-book* as existing for some considerable time." You previously describe him as a "most distinguished Roman Catholic, whose piety and magnanimity, must command the admiration of all." His testimony consists of two portions, one of which bears directly upon this case, viz.: "There is a printed book, which has been publicly sold for a considerable time, entitled *The Taxes of the Apostolic Chancery*, from which a man may learn more enormities and crimes, than from all the

books of, and so forth. And of these crimes, there are some which persons may have the liberty to commit for money, while absolution from all of them may be bought. I refrain from repeating the words, which are enough to strike one with horror." The only portion preceding this, describes a number of shameful dispensations for money. My present business is with the passage regarding the book: and the first question is whether it was written previous to Pinet's publication in 1564. D'Espence went to Rome in 1555, and remained there for some time, much respected, and declined the offer of a cardinalship, which would not have been made had he then been the author of a book which was thought worthy of censure, and fit as such, to be placed on the Index. The offer was made by Paul IV. before the year 1559. He appeared to advantage in 1560, in the meeting of the States at Orleans. In the next year he was at the conference of Poissy on the part of the Catholics, to manage the conference with the Protestants, and went as far as he could for their accommodation, though he did not trench upon the Catholic faith, and for ten years subsequently he does not appear to have been employed. I believe that you will find the work from which you make the quotation, was written not long previous to his death, and upwards of six years after Pinet's book was printed and publicly sold, for a considerable time—and it was placed on the Index, not the original list made by order of Pope Pius IV., and completed in 1564, and upon which it would have been placed had it then been published, but upon the appendix under Sixtus V., between 1585 and 1590, and which may be seen at the library of the Seminary of this city in the following words:

Claudii Espencæi Commentaria, de continentia et in Epistolam ad Titum, with this mollifying addition, *nisi corrigantur*. My authorities are Bossuet, Feller, Aiken, and the Index.

The only result that would follow from your establishing that this work was published in 1555, would be to save Pinet and to throw the disgrace of the fabrication on another—but it would not have proved your statute, nor of course sustained the allegation of the memorial.

As I have no more of the quotation than what you are pleased to furnish, I may be allowed to remark that your two *and so forth* come in a very awkward part of the quotation. I found that one *and so forth*, even in your own hands, made for myself not exactly what I said, and a pair of them in the middle of such a quotation, carry some suspicious appearance. I have some indistinct recollection of this passage, but I shall not venture to make any observations founded on such

an imperfect ground, because my memory is not so faithful as to enable me to publish here an exact copy of what I perhaps got a sight from the lecturer of some college in Rome.

I have now gone through the array which you produced to save the historian of the Prince of Tric, perhaps at the expense of other princes, and must leave it to our readers to decide for themselves upon what we have both laid before them.

I have several other and indispensable duties to which I must attend. I must, therefore, request a day's indulgence, and for which, of course, I should dread to offer you even the fee of the *Tax-book*, as I would not desire to shock or insult you. I shall endeavour, after that which I expect from your kindness, to make my disposition of what remains of your letter.

I have the honour to be, Reverend Sir,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 4, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—In searching for authorities to sustain, by more than my own assertion, the distinction between the Chancery and the Datary and the Penitentiary, I have met with the passage of D'Espence, which I thought I had seen more than once before, and am able to fill up the *and so forth.* I there find that the words for which they were substituted do not change the nature of the quotation,—nor do they weaken my argument, as I trust I shall show, when I shall proceed to exhibit that there were great abuses and corruptions in the proclaiming of indulgences, and in the granting of dispensations, and absolving from penalties, (not from sins,) and that the great efforts of the church had been directed, previous to what you call the Reformation, to the remedy of these crying evils. I have also searched for and found the original decrees of Pope John XXII., establishing the rule for taxation in 1320, and the true title of the Roman edition of Silber's *Tax-book* in 1514. All which are at the service of any person who wishes to come and read or copy them.

I now proceed to your effort to show that the Chancery was the proper court for enacting "a statute making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed." I pass

over your general remarks. You say that you show by my own admission, "that the Chancery is the tribunal from which alone the taxes could have issued."

I stated, you say, that one of its present duties was "absolution from ecclesiastical censures, viz.: excommunication, suspension, and so forth," but "not from sins." I did; and for our present purpose it is unnecessary to enter into proof that in this respect its duty is ministerial, not judicial. My words were that it "had cognizance of the causes"—but the phrase as applied to the Roman court, has not the same meaning as it has in our courts, where having cognizance of a cause means having jurisdiction and judicial authority. In Rome, it means receiving the petition or appeal, examining its merits, preparing a brief of its nature, reporting it, together with its merits to the Pope, receiving his decision, recording it, and giving a certificate, or other document thereof in the proper form to the party: and the different nature of the courts, creates necessarily this distinction. It would be an idle exhibition of Roman jurists and canonists for me to spread out references to prove this. I shall, however, place the books in the hands of any one who questions the truth of my statement. You next proceed to say what I admit, that an "indulgence is not a license to commit sin, neither is it a mode of regulating the price at which sin might be committed, nor is it absolution from sin already committed." Hence, you conclude, that indulgences come not within the jurisdiction of the Penitentiary, but of the Chancery. Sir, they come within the jurisdiction of neither one nor the other, and your conclusion is bad, because your enumeration is imperfect: there are other tribunals besides those of the Penitentiary and the Chancery, and they belong to one of those others. You cannot forget that I told you of a dozen or two dodging places; I acknowledge that I am shut out of the Penitentiary, but you have not got me into the Chancery, because I have got the other dodging places open to me.

Now the remainder of your argument has no hold on me, for it proceeds upon the assumption of what I have never admitted, but which I shall now examine. Your effort is to identify an indulgence with an absolution from excommunication: and that as absolution from excommunication was an attribute of the Chancery, of course an indulgence was within the jurisdiction of this tribunal. You must recollect, sir, that I always denied that an indulgence was "a statute, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed." So that if you should even prove that indulgences

come within the jurisdiction of the Chancery, you would not have proved your case.

You quote Mosheim to show that indulgences, in their origin, were nothing more than a remission "of the temporal consequences of sin." To a certain extent I not only admit that they were so in their origin, but that they never were or could be more. Such, sir, is now, and always has been the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. You attempt to restrict these temporal consequences of sin to "suspension and excommunication from the church." Here is the point of our difference. You quote Faber to sustain you: "Faber correctly says that they were only at first 'a shortening of the period of excommunication.'" This I do not admit; and Faber is not authority for me. But this is not the place to discuss the merits of this question. All that is necessary to overturn your assumption, is to show that in Rome an indulgence was considered to be a very different matter from an absolution from excommunication, and therefore that the granting of the latter was not bestowing the former. This is shown by the notorious fact, that is, notorious to any person at all acquainted with our doctrine and practice, viz., "That a person under excommunication is incapable of receiving an indulgence." You will find this in every Catholic treatise on either indulgence or censures. St. Thomas of Aquin, born in 1227, one of our best doctors, writes (4ta. dist. 20, quæst. 1, art. 5, quœstiunc 2,) *nec pœnas, quœ in foro externo et contentioso sive Ecclesiastico, sive seculari infliguntur, indulgentia tollere possit.* "Nor can an indulgence remove the penalties which are inflicted in the external and contentious court, whether ecclesiastical or secular." Now excommunication, suspensions, and the like, are penalties inflicted in the external ecclesiastical court—and they cannot be removed by the grant of an indulgence: evidently, therefore, it was the doctrine of the church to which St. Thomas belonged six hundred years ago, as it is to-day, that an indulgence was not an absolution from excommunication, nor a shortening of a period of excommunication. And Cardinal Bellarmine, who was born in 1542, and died in 1621, gives us additional reason, (*De Indulg.* lib. 1, chap. vii. prop. 3,) where he tells us that all writers agree on this, "because the penalties of the external court are inflicted for the good of the common weal, that the wicked may be deterred from their sins, and that good men may enjoy security. Moreover, indulgences are granted only to penitents and persons reconciled to God; but these penalties of the external court are inflicted chiefly on the obstinate and rebels. Finally, indulgences, as has been said, take the place of penitential satisfaction; wherefore they do not remove any

other penalty than that which we owe in the secret and penitential tribunal." *Siquidem pœnæ fori externi propter beneficium Reipublicæ infliguntur,* and so forth.

Thus, sir, it is not true that "both the history of indulgences and my admission show the Chancery to have been the proper bureau for a tariff regulating the prices of indulgences." And though you should have proved even that, it would not have sanctioned the original assertion, for it would still remain to be shown that this tribunal "passed a statute making assassinations, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects for license and taxation, regulating the price at which each might be committed." And again, I must remark that you would have failed in showing it to be a license, for excommunication or any other censure cannot be incurred until after the crime for which it is a penalty shall have been committed, and absolution is given to remove a penalty which has been incurred; and it would be rather strange to find a man applying to-day for a license to commit a crime last week. I have seen a foreigner, who could not be blamed for not knowing our language, laughed at, for asking a companion—"Will you ride out with me yesterday?"—and quite unconscious of their mirth, he continued, "to-morrow was a very pleasant day." Sir, you make a mistake in imagining that the popes and bishops taught that indulgences remitted sins, though you are quite right in stating that indulgences were abused. The phrase which you and others thus misunderstand is a technical one in the Roman Court, and, I acknowledge, is very liable to misinterpretation; and I always considered it, as I still do, to be on that ground very objectionable. To the ordinary reader it seems to convey the meaning of remitting sin: in technical parlance it means only to remit those temporal consequences of sin, which we believe to be removable by an indulgence.

I mean nothing offensive to you in illustrating the expression by another, which you very distinctly understand. I recollect, at an early period of my life, in the year 1798, the part of Ireland in which I then lived was subject to military rule. All criminal cases, be the offences what they may, were tried by the officers of a court-martial; but in all cases, except offences against military law, and acts of rebellion, they were directed in their sentences to conform to the criminal code. Some unfortunate robbers were tried, convicted, and sentenced to be hanged. Moved by the fear of death, they desired the assistance of a clergyman; but when he went to the prison he was refused admittance, and upon demanding the cause, he was told that such were the express orders of the court. The bishop, at the request of the priest, waited upon

the president of the court, a brave, generous, and noble-hearted colonel of the line, who received him courteously, and upon learning the cause of his visit, shed tears, and said that he was greatly afflicted himself at what he could not but consider unnecessary cruelty; but that he had no choice, and he was very sorry for it, the statute positively and too plainly declared, in so many words, that they must suffer death without the benefit of clergy. He had looked through the book in vain, with the aid of other officers, to try whether their case might not be brought within that class in which benefit of clergy could be allowed; but alas! their search was fruitless; the more closely they searched, the more were they convinced that a priest could not be admitted. He was, however, quite relieved, when assured by a respectable lawyer that it was a technical phrase, whose meaning really was not what it at first seemed to be.—I assure you, sir, in sincerity, in honour, in good faith, and as I shall answer to God for the assertion, that the phrase which seems to imply remission of sins in our documents respecting indulgences, is a technical one, like that of the benefit of clergy; and with us it has not the meaning that you were led to believe—of that, however, more hereafter.

I should hope, sir, that you have now some doubts that your demonstration was mathematical. Now, sir, that you should not suppose this to be a mere assertion of mine, and I have before assured you that with us an indulgence [35] is not a remission of sin, I refer you to Bellarmine, (*De Indulg.* lib. ii. chap. iii.) where he is answering a passage from No. 39, chap. 9, of Calvin's *Institutes.—Porro indulgentiæ non remittunt culpam, neque lethalem neque venialem, sed solam pœnam eamque temporariam.* "Moreover, indulgences do not remit guilt, either deadly or venial, but only the penalty, and that temporary." This, however, is straying from the true question, which is the enactment of the statute by the Roman Chancery.

To keep me still in Chancery, however, you object to the account I gave of the case of Parrhasius. You confound a dispensation with an indulgence. My acquaintance is extensive with Protestants, both on the other side of the Atlantic, and on this. Many of them are to me dear and kind friends, from whom I have received valuable favours. I have

[35] The English "Indulgence" is an inaccurate and misleading rendering of the Latin theological term *Indulgentia.* Frequently the word, indulgence, conveys the idea of some deordination—an excess—an unreasonable yielding. With this restricted definition fixed in their minds, Protestants persist in confounding the Catholic sense of Indulgence with some species of license, or permission to do wrong. The truth of the doctrine concerning indulgences would be much helped by the substitution of some other word.—Ed.

frequently held friendly conversations with them upon the subject of religion, and I have read, as a matter of duty, rather extensively, the writings of Protestants on the subject of religion. I assure you, sir, that I scarcely recollect, at this moment, three who I believed knew what was with us an indulgence, and the difference between it and a dispensation. I trust I shall have an opportunity of explaining it—but this is not its place.

The case of Parrhasius has nothing whatever to do with an indulgence: it was altogether a case of dispensation, and as we call it in *foro externo* or the external court—that is in ecclesiastical matters disciplinary regulation—you translate the French word *dispense*, which is also technical, "indulgence,"—the proper technical French word for which is *indulgence*. Bayle's translators give the accurate and proper word "dispensation." Upon this ambiguity you try to carry the case to Chancery, as a case of indulgence which you also have incorrectly imagined to be a Chancery business. In his own Latin, Parrhasius uses the proper technical word for "a rehabilitation."

You told me "it was not so" when I stated that it was a case of "rehabilitation for two clandestine marriages." To a certain extent you are right, for although there were two clandestine marriages, Parrhasius only asked for the rehabilitation of one, and you call that one "a secret marriage." You say "it was not so; it was a case of incest committed by a niece of Parrhasius, of which the guilty couple endeavoured to escape the punishment by a secret marriage. That, however, could not shelter them without the Pope's indulgence." You give the French word dispense; Bayle's translators give us, "this was not sufficient to free them from danger unless the Pope would grant them a dispensation." I can scarcely think that you have read Bayle's statement, and that of Parrhasius himself, when I look at your mode of treating it, or I must believe that you are altogether unacquainted with the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, and the laws of Europe.

The case was originally one of incest. A niece of Parrhasius had been married to a lawyer; she died. The widower had criminal communication with a surviving sister: by the laws of the land, they were liable to death, for the crime was a capital offence. Her pregnancy would lead to detection. In this state of things, the guilty pair attempted what you call a "secret marriage," what the translator of Bayle calls a "clandestine marriage." What is the difference? Were they validly married, they could plead the marriage in answer to the capital charge. If there was no marriage, there was no defence, and they were liable to death. The clandestine marriage was no marriage,

because they were incapacitated by law from making a valid contract, by reason of their affinity.

The Pope had the power of dispensing from the operation of the law, and thus enabling the parties to make a contract; that is, in technical language, to rehabilitate the clandestine marriage—and this being done, they could plead the marriage to bar the prosecution.

Now, the request of Parrhasius was to get this dispensation, and in his petition, he requested that a penal fine should be imposed upon the delinquents, and that a dispensation should be granted. The Datary was the proper tribunal for examining the application for dispensing, in cases of marriage impediments, and returning the answers: whenever a fine was imposed, it was there determined what should be the amount. The business of the Chancery was to examine the grant, to rectify, to register, and to engross the papers; and the fees therein received were a fixed compensation for the trouble, the time, and the labour, proportioned to the quantity of writing, and not to the nature of the business.

Parrhasius, after giving the history of their crime and their danger, goes on—*Nisi Deus aliquis eos aspexerit; id est a summo Pontifice veniam incestûs in scriptis impetraverint: ut furtivum dedecus professo matrimonio diluatur. Ad hanc rem velim omnes ingenii tui nervos intendas, utarisque gratia ac auctoritate Lascaris, Phædri, Citrariique et omnium denique amicorum: ut exleges has nuptias, ad evitandum paratæ cædis periculum, Pontifex privilegio, justas ratasque faciat, indicta pro copiarum facultate mulcta.* "Unless some God will look with pity on them: that is, that they shall obtain in writing from the Supreme Pontiff, pardon for the incest, (had he stopped here, you would have been correct, but what follows shows the mode in which it was to be effected,) that this clandestine disgrace may be washed out by an open marriage. For this object I desire that you would exert your best powers of mind, and that you would use the favour and power of Lascar, of Phædrus and of Citharus, and finally of all friends; that in order to escape the danger of the enacted death, the Pontiff would, by a privilege, (that is a dispensation or derogation from the general law, make for the parties a *privata lex*, or special law or privilege) make this marriage good and valid, inflicting a fine according to the means." He then complains of his difficulties and urges that the fine should be as low as possible.

Thus, sir, I apprehend, it was a case of matrimonial dispensation, removing the impediment of affinity, so that a clandestine marriage should be rehabilitated, and thereby incidentally the parties might be

saved from the consequences of incest, not by granting them license to commit it, nor by granting them pardon of the sin, but saving them from criminal conviction in court of law and from the penalty of death. The tribunal of the Datary, which had charge of those dispensations, regulated the amount of the fine. The officers of the Chancery prepared the papers, registered them, gave the proper documents, and demanded the fees they were entitled to, for their labour, according to their fee-bill or *Tax-book*. Parrhasius obtained the dispensation, and was told to bring the amount of the fine with him, when he came to Rome. All this might have been a wicked transaction. I neither defend nor condemn it, but I did assert that the case was one for the rehabilitation of a clandestine marriage—(I wrote two by mistake, as two were mentioned, though only one dispensation was sought, the other marriage not having been invalid, though unfortunate)—and I wrote that it was not a case for the Chancery, but for the Datary, and in so stating, every one who knows anything of the tribunals will say that I was correct. If I do not mistake, even the fine was remitted.

But even if the case were different, and that the petition was to grant a remission of the penalty of death, enacted by the sovereign as the punishment of incest, it would have been a case for the Datary; as this was the proper tribunal for the management of such cases. It would be similar to an application to the Governor of a State to commute a sentence from that of death to fine; and this was not to be done by the Pope as head of the church, but as sovereign of the territory. But it was impossible that such a commutation could take place outside the papal dominions, for he had no sovereignty elsewhere, and as this case occurred without the papal territory, it was not an application for pardon of the penalty, but for that rehabilitation which would raise the bar to the prosecution. You are then, sir, under the most manifest mistake when you assert, "Hence, then, we find the Datary concerned, not with 'rehabilitation,' but with an indulgence for incest, which you say belongs to the Penitentiary. (I said no such thing. It would save much time and trouble not to be making for me assertions which I never made.) Here the Datary grants the indulgence, (no, sir, it was not an indulgence,) and the Datary and Chancery were, you will not deny, the same court." I am obliged to deny it, for truth will not permit me to assert it. You quote Furstiere to sustain you, by referring to the article "Datarie," in his *Universal Dictionary*. I have not consulted it, nor do I know what he says, because I have higher and better authority in the Jurists, whose works you may consult. I point out no one, as they will all sustain my assertion. I also know it from the officers of

the court from whom I received information, when I had occasion to learn from themselves the distinction of the tribunals. The French Academy, you must be aware, also expelled your author from their Society, in 1685, on account of his dictionary; and you also know, I suppose, that Bosnage had made some additions for the Amsterdam edition in 1725, in 4 vols. folio. I now leave to our readers whether "this is conclusive evidence that the argument drawn from the nature of the court is against me."

You add that the Abbe Richard settles this point conclusively; and in adducing him you say, "he admits that the taxes existed in Rome, and that they began under John XXII., (the very Pope who I say regulated the courts,) in 1320." Sir, I never denied that there existed taxes or fees to be paid to the officers of the Chancery for their labour, their time, and their proper compensation for inspecting, correcting, copying, registering, and delivering documents. I not only admitted this, but I said that in many instances "it has frequently happened that their exactions were oppressive and extravagant, and a tax-book of fees was therefore regulated by authority; and any officer demanding or receiving a larger fee than that specified in the *Tax-book* incurred censures himself, and was fined heavily." Richard says the taxes began in 1320. I say they existed previously—for John XXII. in his decree respecting them recites, that, to prevent complaints, he sees proper to regulate the fees or taxes. It is found in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Extrav. Joann. XXII. Tit. xiii.—*Cum ad Sacrosanctæ.* This, then, is but a regulation of what previously existed. I shall make a few extracts: but I shall be happy to show the book to any who may call to see it.

Ne murmurandi inde præbeatur occasio unde gratitudine necessitas aderat collaudandi: neve scriptura redderet onustum quod liberalitas fecerat gratiosum. Qua de re circa literarum nostrarum scripturas, registri quoque nostri, necnon abbreviatorum Rom. curiæ nostræ, illam in taxando volumus moderationem opponi, qua personæ quibus gratiæ hujuscemodi conceduntur, se gratias ipsa apostolica sede liberaliter sentiant consecutas ac literarum ipsarum scriptoribus registri etiam nostri notarumque abbreviatoribus ant edictis, qui interdum in eis etiam multo labore desudant, de suo labore satisfiat. Ad tollendum igitur excessus, difficultates, circuitus et anfractus qui passent ex variis literarum Apostolicarum taxationibus prevenire, sancimus. "Lest occasion for murmuring should be given where the necessity of approbation and praise arose from gratitude; and lest writing should render burdensome what liberality had rendered gracious:—Wherefore we desire that there should be such moderation in taxing, in respect to the writing of our

letters, as also of our register, and of the abbreviations of our Roman Court, as to cause that the persons to whom such favours are granted, should feel that they have liberally received favours from the Apostolic See, and also that sufficient recompense is given to the writers of those letters, also to the writers of our register, and to the aforesaid abbreviators of the notes, who sometimes are exhausted with great labour therein. To remove, therefore, the excesses, difficulties, circumventions, and teasings which may arise from the various taxings of the apostolic letters. We do enact."

After this it proceeds to regulate certain fees for documents therein described, and then lays down the principle upon which the fee may or may not be increased, viz.: It is not to be increased by reason of the greater concession of favour, the larger income of the person who obtains the writing, but only in consideration of the greater quantity of writing, and that the additions must be moderate, fractions of lines are not to be charged, the price of each additional line is specified, each line must contain 120 letters, or twenty-five words. It regulates that for poor persons the fees shall be reduced considerably; giving as a cause that verse of the Psalmist: "Blessed is he who understandeth concerning the needy and the poor." It provides for the difference of coins between Italy and the nations beyond the Alps. It provides for the cases of negligences or carelessness on the part of the officers, that there shall be no new or additional charge for making a good and perfect copy where a bad or imperfect one has been made, and it enacts penalties for any exaction. This is the *Tax-book* of which Abbe Richard writes. You may examine it, sir. It is open to you, to your friends and the public. You may take copies and publish them. Neither you nor any other gentleman of common sense will, after having read it, conclude that the Abbe Richard, by this, proves that the argument from the nature of the court is conclusively against me. You would sir, yourself, retract the assertion, had you read this genuine *Tax-book*. I am quite aware that some Catholics have complained of this tariff, upon the principle that it was wrong to make any charge for what was connected with religion. I give no opinion on the subject, but merely remark that some mode should be devised for supporting clerks and other officers. They must have food and raiment.

As to your next topic, I am content to leave what I wrote concerning Luther and Calvin, and their associates and followers, and what you have written against that argument, before our readers—with only one or two remarks. I had observations to make upon your negative pregnant, but I feel that they are unnecessary and that I have been

driven into great length. As to the book being known to them because it was known to the princes: you must feel now at least, that until your premises shall have been established, your conclusion cannot be drawn: and though Calvin lived until 1564, Luther died in 1546, the year in which you stated the protest of the princes to have been drawn, but which I am certain you would not now give as its date. Thus Luther was dead sixteen years before the protest was drawn up, and Calvin died the year before the book of Tuppius was printed, and thirty-three years before the publication of that edition in which Bayle informs us the passages which might pass for an edition of the *Tax-book* were found.

I shall show you that long previous to the Reformation "indignation and surprise were felt at the traffic," against which you so justly inveigh, and that they who expressed both were neither obscure nor inactive. The document from which I have given an extract, was in force nearly two hundred years previous to the first efforts of Luther. You overlook dates again when you write: "The tariff would have appeared no evil in those days. It was merciful in comparison with the gross and unbridled profligacy of avarice which Luther and Calvin saw everywhere around them, and which caused them to leave a church which practised such things." You have told us of the existence of this tariff in Silber's Roman edition of 1514, and in the Cologne edition of 1515, and the date of Luther's complaints is 1517, and that of Calvin's birth was 1509, so that this act of mercy had been done, at least, before he was five years of age.

One word as to the argument founded by Bayle and which you seem to adopt, upon the mode of entry upon the Index: *Cum sit depravata ab Hæretics.* What were the facts? There had long existed a genuine fee bill, or *Tax-book,* by which the compensation of the clerks, the registers, the abbreviators was settled, so that they should be remunerated for their labour and the devotion of their time. Like the officers of our courts or offices, this was their occupation, and for this they deserved a support to be derived from some source. It was thought reasonable as our legislature thinks of our ordinaries, our sheriffs, our registers of mesne conveyance, and their clerks, that they should be supported by those for whom they did service, and to prevent extortions, a fee bill or *Tax-book* was enacted, not by the Chancery, but by the legislature. This book was printed and was not censured, though many Catholics complained that it had a bad appearance and that no fees should be charged, but that some other mode of compensating the officers should be devised, and that the individual getting papers should not be charg-

ed. An unfortunate religious division takes place, and some of that portion opposed to Rome interpolate this book, and introduce fabricated and disgraceful clauses. This is discovered, and surely it was not the original *Tax-book*, that was to be condemned and denounced, but these copies which had been interpolated, and into which the forgeries had been introduced. Hence the proper and only correct phrase was used, for whilst it denounces the depraved copies, it leaves untouched those which are authentic.

I did hope, I should have been able to conclude my reply to your letter this day. Something, however, still remains, though not requiring a great deal of observation. I shall give my remarks in as few words as I can, and exhibit to you what I acknowledge to have been abuses.

I have the honour to remain,

Reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 4, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—In order to explain one of the contradictions which I charged on Bayle, you tell me that where I mentioned "rich" and "poor," nothing of the kind was said in the original; it only mentions "they who have no money,"—I really thought that they were poor; and I thought that they who were able to pay the Datary were, when compared to them, rich. Now, I did not write that "the poor were not to receive the indulgences," as you give it, but "not to receive the comfort of these dispensations;" and the passage which you gave from Saurin was, "take notice particularly, that such graces and dispensations are not granted to the poor: for not having wherewithal to pay, they cannot be comforted," (lett. of Aug. 13;) and these are the exact works in Bayle, with this addition, that after the word *particularly*, which he gives in italics, he says in a parenthesis, ("and indeed the thing deserves it.") This is my error, notwithstanding I kept closer to the text than you did; for, in ecclesiastical language, a dispensation is not an indulgence.

To get rid of the other charge which I made, you refer to the original, to correct my quotations. You stated that D'Aubigne says there were "Catholics who wished not to 'suppress,' but to 'extirpate' (*extirper*) altogether this damning book." I before told you, that I used

the book in the Charleston Library, and you must blame that, not me, for the word "suppress." I copied from that Protestant translation. I am also content that your observations on my remark, concerning the variance of titles and of coins, should have their full weight.

You tell me that I "rest my whole case on proving Pinet's work to have been a deliberate forgery;" not so, sir. I have all through stated that it was my opinion that he was the original fabricator, but that in this I may be mistaken. At this moment, such is still my opinion. Should I even have erred in charging it upon him, rather than upon the Protestant princes, or some other ingenious and industrious friends, the ground upon which the case rests will be untouched, viz.: the testimony of the tribunal, publicly and openly made in the face of the world, as soon as the interpolations appeared, that they were depravata; the absence of all evidence, that such items were in any authentic copy, the denial of the Catholics everywhere; and I can, should it be required, add to this, that whilst in councils, and from kingdoms and states in the Catholic communion, complaints were made of all sorts of abuses and enormities, no mention or allusion is made in any one of them, to such items being upon this book, though they complain of extravagant fees, and of dispensations which in their result were considered to be equivalent to a license to continue in crime, and called for their reformation. I could add the manifest impossibility of continuing the civilization of Europe, if such a practice had been permitted, and the folly of imagining that the common sense of Christendom would have allowed its existence for one month. Dr. Lingard observes upon it as follows: (page 113, *Tracts.*)

"Mr. Mesurier has a third and still more powerful argument in reserve. He hopes to silence his adversary, by the testimony of a book which has long been the pride of the bigot and the polemic: has often reddened with shame the cheek of the most obdurate Papist, and, what is still of more utility to mankind, has furnished the learned, pious, and visionary Mr. Granville Sharp, with a key to unlock to astonished mortals, the secrets contained in the *Book of Revelations.* This book, so pregnant with important consequences, is the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ*, or a tariff of the prices at which sins may be redeemed in the Roman Chancery, the great custom-house of human guilt. If the reader will be at the trouble to peruse the different articles of this valuable code, he will at least acknowledge that the Pope is extremely moderate in his demands, and wonder that his holiness has not employed a British financier to improve the receipts of his treasury. In England, you cannot obtain a license to keep a setting-dog, without paying a tax of ten

shillings; at Rome, it seems, a man may murder his father, and enjoy the estate, for the payment of the same duty. Here, one-and-twenty shillings are demanded, for permission to powder your hair once in twelve months; there, for an equal sum, you may keep a mistress, without endangering your salvation. However, should Mr. Le Mesurier and his friend stray as far as Rome, I would not have them rely with too much confidence on the *Liber Taxæ Cancellariæ*; they might find themselves in the same unpleasant situation as the Roman nobleman, mentioned by O'Leary, who, when he was accused of having three wives living at the same time, attempted to justify his conduct by observing, that he had not been able to meet with one with whom he could be happy. 'Since it is so difficult,' replied the Pontiff, Sixtus Quintus, 'to please you in this world, you shall go and try your fortune in the other; there, women are more numerous, and you may find one to your liking.' The *Taxæ Romanæ Cancellariæ* could not save him; he was tried for polygamy, and executed."

You meet my statement respecting the decadence of its fame in Europe, by mentioning that Robertson is a book of education, and that it is still found upon his pages. So it will, and ought to be found, as long as his book shall be printed. You say Schlegel quotes D'Espence, in a note appended to a new edition of Mosheim. I have already shown cause, as I think, why D'Espence's reference could as well have been made to Pinet's edition, as to the uncorrupted *Tax-box*, which some writers conjecture to have been the object of his most harsh and undeserved remarks: to these you add Bishop Watson, in whose theological treatise its genuineness is sustained, and the Protestants reprinted it in Paris in 1820. Now, all this, notwithstanding, I must say that, in my younger days, extracts from it were in one or two of the common books of every school where I received my education, from the moment I learned my letters, until I went to college; and these schools were not exceptions to the great bulk of those in the country. Its truth was early impressed upon my mind, and it was only by long investigation that the impression was removed. In England I have been told that the case was the same. Nearly forty years have elapsed since I was a learner in those schools, and twenty have passed away since I have had an opportunity of observing them; but, in 1819, I could scarcely point out a school or school-book which contained the catalogue. Doctor Lingard testifies for a later period. Writing of it, he has the following in page 115 of one of his tracts:

"That during a period of religious ferment, it should have obtained credit in England, cannot excite surprise: but I had thought that in

the present enlightened age, it had been consigned to the contempt which it deserves. Even from Guthrie's *Geography*, in which it retained an honourable place during so many editions it has recently been expunged by the liberality of the publishers, and I am happy to observe, that its present existence entirely depends on the credit of the firm of Messrs. Le Mesurier, Granville Sharp, & Company."

I recollect the time when the book used to be quoted in the Irish and British parliaments as authority. Subsequently it was flouted from these places by the research and eloquence of Grattan, of Burke, of Flood, of Sheridan, of Pitt, of Fox, and of a host of such men. This may, perhaps, excuse the boldness of my assertion.

I am far from expecting that you should at once give up your present impressions. It cannot be looked for. Yet, sir, from a mind like yours, I should expect, not immediately, but after reflection, even a concession that the evidence is not conclusive that a "statute" was "formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime subjects of license and taxation, regulating the price at which each might be committed."

As regards the statements of the forgeries and fictions of Maria Monk and the clergymen, I quoted them not to insult the Protestant world, nor was such my object in producing the extracts from Whittaker. It was to show that in assailing us, our tenets and our practices are perpetually represented to be what we say they are not, whilst inarguing with Protestants we uniformly abstain from charging them with any doctrine or practices which they disavow. We take their own testimony for their own belief: but we are not treated so. We never force upon them books which they disclaim, nor do we pretend to know their doctrines better than they know them themselves. Neither do we charge them with concealing and disavowing what they do believe. But unfortunately, we are not met in the like spirit, not treated in the like manner: and when documents are forged and works are interpolated, and practices are falsely ascribed to us; justice, truth, religion and honour require that we should not succumb, but that we should call those things by their proper names. Sir, I charge this upon a number of Protestant writers at various times. God forbid I should charge it upon the Protestant community. A vast number of my friends and acquaintances amongst them are men of the most sterling integrity, of the highest honour, and for whom I have great respect and warm affection. They abhor forgery, and fraud, and fiction, and would not countenance either of them. I have not the honour of your acquaintance, but from what I have learned of your character, I believe you to

be as incapable of either of those vices as I trust I myself am. Let it not then be imputed to me that I "denounce the whole Protestant world." Sir, if you look to Whittaker's words, he makes no such denunciation; he says that "forgery was a disease of Protestantism;" this does not denounce "the whole Protestant world;"—he says "it was peculiar to Protestantism." This does not sustain your commentary. Sir, I have no disposition to enter in this place upon a vindication of the Jesuits against the witticisms and denunciations of Paschal, "who," you tell me, "was one of the most brilliant ornaments of my church." Again, sir, I correct your mistake. I am a Roman Catholic; unfortunately, this prodigy of genius was not: he was a Jansenist, and as perfectly outside the church to which I belong, as you are. Again, sir, you are quite under a mistake in attributing the compilation of the Index to the Jesuits. It neither was nor is in their charge: its superintendence was lodged in other hands, though occasionally a Jesuit may be a member of the tribunal.

But you tell me that I say nothing "about the notorious third Lateran Council, which makes not only falsehood, but perjury, a virtue, in behalf of the church." I must avow my ignorance of the fact, and believe that you labour under some delusion upon this score. When you give me the proof, it will be to me a most unexpected novelty; until then, you must give me leave to think that there must be some serious mistake.

We think differently as to who gave occasion to this controversy; and if I have done the Church of Rome no good by it, I am under a great delusion, if thereby, I have done it as much injury as I would, had I silently acquiesced in the charge that "the Roman Chancery formerly passed a statute, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, regulating the price at which each might be committed."

Now, sir, I feel it due to you, to our readers, and to myself, that I should give, as briefly as possible, an exhibition of the true nature of an indulgence, of a dispensation, and of absolution from censures and sins. I neither intend, nor seek for controversy, in giving this explanation, and I shall studiously endeavour to give no room nor occasion therefor, as I do not intend to assail the tenets of others, nor even to vindicate those of the church to which I belong, but by this explanation simply to show why I have so often asserted that you made mistakes, and why I refused admitting that the granting of indulgences was proof of the existence, in the Roman Catholic Church, of those rates of taxation which I abhor as much as you do. The nature of the abuses which

existed, to a deplorable extent, will thence be better understood, and it will be seen that as strong, if not stronger language than that quoted by you, is fairly applicable to them, and was used by some of the best men who sustained the Roman Catholic Church.

I have the honour to remain, reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 7, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—I now proceed to lay before our readers that view of the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, which will clearly exhibit the true nature of the abuses and corruption which is fairly chargeable on several of its members and some of its tribunals.

In every religious society, an individual has two relations, one to God, the other to the body of which he is a member. The laws of God cannot be modified by man: the society is to make its own regulations where God has left it freedom of action. The violation of God's law is called sin; the violation of the laws of society are offences against the body: they may or may not be sinful, but at present we shall view them only as they are violations of order. God punishes sin chiefly in a future state of existence; the society punishes violations of its order in this world: it cannot interfere with the prerogative of the Almighty, nor prescribe to him terms for the exercise of his high attributes of justice and mercy.

In the Roman Catholic Church there are two courts to which the individual is amenable, and they correspond with the above relations: the one, that of conscience—which is called the *forum internum*, or "interior court"—in which the relation towards God is discussed and decided,—the other is called the *forum externum*, or "external court," in which the relations of the individual with the society are discussed and disposed of. In the *forum internum*, the conscience of the individual is the accuser, no witnesses are called; the law of God, in respect to the sinner is the rule and the only rule of action. In the *forum externum*, or "outward court," men may accuse, prosecute, and procure conviction the laws of the society are the rule of action. We may now observe that the law of God alone is to be regarded in the court of conscience of the *forum internum*, and the ecclesiastical laws or those of the church, which is the soicety, in the "outward court,"

or in *foro externo.* In this latter court, a prosecutor contends for the guilt of the accused, whilst the accused party contends for his innocence, and hence it is called "the contentious court,"—*forum contentiosum.*

It frequently happens that for one act the individual is amenable to both courts, but in different ways. Thus, a person is guilty of intoxication; he has violated the laws of God, his conscience accuses and convicts him, and he must look to God for pardon upon the terms which he prescribes, or he must endure the penalty of sin: the wages of sin is death, not merely of the body but of the soul, separation from God. Pardon can be obtained only in that way which Christ established, viz.: by true repentance on the part of the sinner, and by obtaining the application of the merits of the Saviour in that way which he appointed. This is a transaction of the internal court: but the individual is amenable to the *forum externum* or the tribunal of the church for this same act, because of the scandal given to the community and the disgrace brought upon the body, and here he is prosecuted, and if convicted, he is to endure the penalty affixed to the crime. Now, it may happen that an individual is convicted in one of these courts and is acquitted in the other for the very same act. His own conscience may convict him before God, and yet the ecclesiastical tribunal may erroneously acquit him; and, although his conscience should acquit him, yet the judges of the court may erroneously convict him.

The internal court takes cognizance not only of actions but of words, thoughts and desires: the external or contentious court takes cognizance only of overt acts. The morality of the members of the church and their whole religious deportment in their relation to God may then be considered the business chiefly of this internal court: the discipline of the church, the preservation of order and the relations of members to the body may be considered chiefly the business of this contentious or external court; and each may be considered to be independent of the other.

This obvious distinction being kept in view, it is plain that all which regards the reconciliation of the sinner with God takes place in the internal court: all that regards his reconciliation with the church is matter for the external court.

The great question which first presents itself to us is: "How is this reconciliation with God to be effected? Is it by the payment of money? The doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is and always has been, that by the law of God, the sinner cannot be reconciled to him, except by true repentance and through the merits of Jesus Christ

our only Redeemer. I shall here give the doctrinal chapters of the Council of Trent on this subject, as they were adopted and approved by that assembly in the sixth session, celebrated on the 13th of January, 1547. [See vol. ii. pp. 207-212.]

All this regards the interior court, and is not, by any means, matter with which the exterior court has any concern; and here the Council of Trent lays down the unchangeable law of God, the unvarying doctrine of the church, which neither pope nor council, nor any tribunal can alter, and with one particle of which no human tribunal can dispense.

Neither Chancery, nor Penitentiary, nor Datary has ever interfered with this tribunal. Each bishop, in his diocess, ordains priests, and whilst he believes them qualified, he gives them jurisdiction to hear the penitent sinner, to teach him his obligation according to this law, and to carry it into execution. Neither the bishop nor the pope, nor [any] tribunal, can require any information of what the penitent has told, and was it required by either of them, the priest is bound rather to die than to communicate it. In the performance of his duty, the law of God, and not the acts of external tribunals, is to be his guide. It is here, and here only, that absolution for sin is given, and no priest could be guilty of worse simony than to accept of money, if the penitent should be so silly as to offer it, for this absolution: because, the members of the church are all taught that all the forms are useless, unless they have the disposition of true repentance, and that God will not ratify an absolution given to one who does not truly repent. Thus no division of Christians require a more perfect repentance and abandonment of sin than we do; and we require more, for we require confession and satisfaction.

Now all this was done in the sixth session of the council, on the 13th of January, 1547, that is, fourteen years and eleven months before the protest of the Protestant princes was delivered at Frankfort—of course they knew that this was the Catholic doctrine.

It is then our doctrine that the guilt of sin is remitted only by the power of God, through the merits of Christ, and upon the conditions which he requires; amongst which are true repentance and the ministry of the priest. As soon as the guilt is remitted, the liability to eternal punishment ceases; but it is a doctrine of ours, that God frequently, for his own wise purposes, subjects the repentant and pardoned sinner to a temporary punishment. I shall illustrate it by reference to a scriptural fact.

When Nathan announced to David upon his repentance, that God had taken away his sin, the guilt was removed and the penalty of eternal

death was remitted, but the temporal punishment of the death of his child was announced. I could multiply instances, but this will suffice. We believe, also, that by what the explanation, above given, calls "satisfaction," God will frequently be moved to extend still farther his mercy, and to diminish, or altogether to remove this temporal punishment. Thus we read, that David kept a fast and lay upon the ground during the sickness of the child; but when its death was announced to him he arose and ate, and in explanation, he said, "while the child was living I fasted and wept for him: for I said who knoweth whether the Lord may not yet give him to me." Had the child been given, it would have been what we call an "indulgence," and thus it is not a remission of sin, nor leave to commit sin, nor the remission of the eternal punishment due to sin, nor the absolution from an excommunication, nor is it a dispensation from the observance of a law: but an indulgence is "the remission of the whole, or a part of the temporal punishment which sometimes remains due to the penitent and pardoned sinner, after his guilt and the eternal punishment have been removed." And thus no person can profit of an indulgence except after he shall have repented and been pardoned by the Almighty God through the merits of Jesus Christ. Whether God gave power to the Apostles to grant indulgences upon certain conditions, whether that power still exists in the church, and where it is lodged if it does, are questions which would open a new field of controversy, and from which I promised to abstain.

Our readers will now perceive why, in examining the truth of your assertion, that the Roman Chancery passed a statute licensing the commission of crimes for certain sums of money, I stated that the use or abuse of indulgences had no bearing on the question.

I shall, in my next, endeavour to wind up my explanation, by showing the nature of dispensations, and their abuse, as also the nature of censures, and the abuses in granting absolution from them, and the manner in which the granting of indulgences was long and extensively abused.

I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 9, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—I now proceed to give our readers a view of the

transactions of the external or contentious court, and of some of its proceedings. This may be called the tribunal of discipline, according to ecclesiastical canons or laws, as the other may be considered the tribunal of religious intercourse with heaven, founded upon the teaching and institution of the Saviour.

The general disciplinary laws of the church chiefly regard the lives and manners of the clergy, the mode of placing them in office, and of depriving them thereof, the effects of ecclesiastical censures, the mode of inflicting them, or of removing them, the impediments of marriage, and such like. I need not inform you that laws for this purpose must be passed in general terms, and bind all the individuals comprised in these terms. And it frequently happened that special cases were found, in which the hardship or inconvenience was so great, or the benefit to be derived by excepting this case from the operation of the law was so manifest, that the legislator would have excepted it had it come before him; but as the words of the law embraced the case, there would have been no remedy. To meet this inconvenience, the Pope has a power of dispensing with the individual case, so that the law shall still be of force, but shall not apply in this particular instance. Whether the Pope has this power by virtue of his office, independently of the church, and from the Saviour himself, or whether the legislative tribunal of the church vested it in him, so as to meet such cases, is matter of no moment: this power is acknowledged to be in him, that for sufficient cause, of which he is to judge, he may exempt an individual, in a particular case, from the operation of the general laws of the church. No Catholic believes, what is falsely imputed to us, that he can dispense with the law of God. A dispensation, then, is the exempting of a particular case from the operation of a general law of the church. Thus, the general law says that persons related to each other in a certain degree of consanguinity, shall be incapable of contracting marriage with each other. Catholics do not believe this to be a divine law, for the law in Leviticus was only for the Jewish people, and is no part of the Christian code: they regard it as an ecclesiastical law, and believe that the tribunal which could bind by the enactment, could loose by the exception. It has frequently happened that disputed successions have threatened dreadful calamities of war and all its consequences, and that the whole train of evils could be averted by a marriage of the disputants, but they were within the forbidden degrees. Here was an evident case which the legislature never intended to include, though it was forced to use general terms, and it was one of the cases which was left to the discretion of the Pope. Some canons go even so far as to say that some of those dispensations

should be given only to great princes, and for public cause. To grant a dispensation which exempts the individual, for sufficient reasons, from the operation of a general law, is not then an indulgence; but it is a grace or favour, and frequently a great public benefit. Would it not be, in a great measure, similar to obtaining a decree from the chancellor upon the merits of a particular case in equity, where the law would, by its letter, work an injustice in the common pleas? Nor is the dispensation granting a license to commit sin. No dispensation could be granted to offend God. The Almighty himself could not grant such a dispensation: it would be incompatible with his attributes.

I now come to censures. A censure is an ecclesiastical penalty inflicted upon an offender. One is suspension, by which a clergyman is, without losing his office, prohibited from performing its duties, either for a definite time, as a month, or a year, or for an indefinite time, viz., until he shall be absolved from the censure. Another is excommunication, by which any member of the church is deprived of the use of the sacraments and a variety of other advantages, until absolved from the censure. There are others, but this exhibition will suffice. Now absolving a clergyman from suspension is an act of jurisdiction of the external court; it is not absolving him from sin, which is an act of the interior court; and, clearly, though it is a grace of favour, it is not an indulgence, nor is it a license to commit sin. To absolve a clergyman or a layman from excommunication, was only to open the way to such a person to have recourse to the sacraments, that receiving them with proper dispositions, pardon may be obtained from God, in the court of conscience, but it was not pardoning the sin, nor giving license to commit a sin; and though it was a grace and favour, it was not an indulgence. This, too, was an act of the exterior court, and was a portion of discipline. Thus, it is clear that neither an indulgence, nor a dispensation, nor absolution from a censure could be "a statute formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, regulating the price at which each might be committed."

I now come to remark upon the abuses.

In order to know the nature of any transaction, we must look to its circumstances. Europe had been scourged during centuries by the incursions of the barbarian hordes that overthrew the remnant of the Roman empire. The church had, in a measure, civilized them, and brought them to bow their necks to the yoke of the Gospel. A collection of predatory bands were assuming the form of a multitude of independent principalities. Charlemagne, to a certain extent, had succeeded in

blending them into feudal confederation. They professed the Christian religion, they acknowledged the Pope as its head, but they generally tyrannized over the bishops. The ancient canons of discipline were severe, and when any crime had been publicly committed, though the individual had confessed in private, he was required to do the penance or satisfaction in public, and the process was in many instances long and severe. The courtiers and the favourites of the chieftains, impatient of the restraints of these canons, and equally unwilling to observe even in private, the fasts and other penitential works enjoined by their confessors, and yet equally unwilling to abandon the principles of their faith, sought by all means to procure relaxations: they offered to compensate by alms and works of mercy to the poor, for the relaxation of that rigorous discipline which they were unwilling to observe. Amongst the relaxations which were made, we find some specified in the canons of the Council of Triburia, once a royal villa, formerly called Tribur of Trewr, between Mayence and Openheim, on the right bank of the Rhine, in the present territory of Hesse Darmstadt. The 54th canon gives two reasons for the mitigation, which has relation only to a special case, but the reasons are of general application. The Council of Ancyra, in Galatia, a province of Asia Minor, which was celebrated in the year 314, regulated, amongst other matters, in canon xxii., that persons guilty of voluntary homicide, should not be admitted to reconciliation until they should have done specified acts of penance during years, and not receive the holy Eucharist until there was a likelihood of death. The Council of Triburia, in 895, after reciting the substance of the canon of Ancyra, goes on to say, "but it appears good and useful to us, who are pastors of Christ's sheep; because of the circumstances, *qualitate*, of modern times, and the frailty of men, that by synodal authority and general judgment we should moderate this chastisement, and fix a certain and definite time for the penance, lest a very long period of penance should occasion weariness and disgust in the negligent, and that the work of salvation may be increased for those more speedily carried through the exercises." It fixed the duration of the penance at seven years, diminishing in rigour as the time proceeded, and in some of the periods, and for some of the exercises, allowing a relaxation from part of the rigour of one day, upon condition of supporting three poor persons sufficiently on that day, or giving an equivalent amount in money or value to some work of charity. It also recognised in the bishops the power of using their discretion, upon reasonable and sufficient grounds, of granting indulgences, that is, by a judicial exercise of power, remitting still farther through the superabundant

merits of Christ, and in consideration of the communion of saints, forty days, or one year or more of these works of satisfaction, which were offered to God, in lieu of the temporal punishment which sometimes remained due to sin, after the guilt and the eternal punishment were remitted to the penitent sinner, and these remissions were called indulgences of forty days, of a year, and so forth; and Catholics believe that when this power is properly used, the Almighty mercifully remits the temporal punishment corresponding to the amount which would be remitted by the penance of those days. This power, however, may be abused; and they do not believe that God is bound by the mal-administration in this case, and that they who would place confidence in such mal-administration only deceive themselves. The canons of Triburia were founded upon just and sufficient grounds, and the canons of Ancyra recognise the same power of granting indulgences in the bishops. *Modus autem*, and so forth. "Let the measure of this penance be subject to the discretion of the bishops, that according to the conduct of the penitents, they may be able to extend for the slothful, and to shorten it for those who carefully hasten." (*Can.* xxii.)

The Council of Triburia was not an exception, but an illustration of the process by which a general relaxation was forced upon the church by the spirit of the times. The bishops soon felt the tyranny of the little and sometimes of the great sovereigns, who, by all efforts, sought to break down the restraints of the ancient rigour in forcing them to grant unreasonable indulgences for insufficient causes, until the rapid decay of their power exhibited a large body, especially of the German prelates, as mere powerless instruments in the hands of those petty despots.

This, sir, is the true cause why they willingly sought to be delivered from the evils of their position, by surrendering to the Holy See exclusively a large portion of that power in granting indulgences which had been exercised by their predecessors. But the surrender of the power was made only after the introduction of many abuses, which could not be immediately redressed. The same spirit, which is found in the present despot of Prussia, had dominion over many a tyrant who professed the Catholic faith—and he held his Magdeburgs, and Mindens, his myrmidons, and minions; and all his prelates had not the firmness of the archbishop of Cologne. This is the first epoch in the introduction of abuses.

The next question is, "What was the benefit of the transfer?" Rome was an independent state; the Pope was a sovereign, and he was therefore less liable to be awed into concessions.

Soon after this period, an additional calamity came upon Christendom. The Saracens, not content with the extinction of Christianity in the East and in the South, were bent upon sweeping it out of Europe by the execution of their scimetars. In order to meet upon their own ground, to force them to look nearer to home, as well as to get possession of the Holy Land, the crusades were undertaken. You and I may differ in our views of their policy; but it was considered a great protection to Christendom, that a powerful army should penetrate into the heart of Palestine and keep possession of Jerusalem. Every encouragement was offered to him who would valiantly fight against those who had sworn the ruin of religion; and indulgences were extended with no sparing hand to those soldiers of the Cross who exposed their lives for its protection against the Crescent. The Holy See was lavish in her favours to those who gave up the enjoyments of home and the safety of their castles for the toils of painful journeys, the privations of the camp, and the turmoil and perils of the battle. Funds became necessary—and by analogy, it was said that they who contributed from their means to support those who fought abroad, were equally engaged in the conflict; and they who contributed the funds claimed to participate in the indulgence. Incontestable monuments of history could, were I allowed it, be produced to prove that such was the process. Thus, discipline was enervated, and indulgences were multiplied, and in many instances they were abused.

At an early period there were collectors of alms, who, authorized by the bishops, by the monasteries, by hospitals, and not unfrequently by the popes, travelled to collect the alms of the faithful. They were like the travelling agents of our bible societies, of our missionary societies, of our church building, and other societies. They were called questors; they exhorted the faithful in all places to contribute to the special objects of their mission, and naturally sought to show the benefit which the contributor would derive from aiding specially their particular institution. They were lavish in the promise of indulgences, and in magnifying their advantages. Yet in no instance that I can discover, do I find that any of them went so far as to fix a certain sum, or rate, or tax for an indulgence. But we have abundant evidence that not only were indulgences too lavishly bestowed, and without sufficient cause, and their advantages exaggerated, but that this was done in many instances for vile gain by unworthy men, and that much of the money thus collected was profligately misapplied. But was this in accordance with the doctrines of the church? Was it encouraged and practised

by its authorized representatives? Was there any step taken to reform the abuse?

I regret, deeply, my being so crippled for space in giving the answers.

The fourth Council of Lateran was held in Rome, in the Church of St. John of Lateran, in the year 1215. Pope Innocent III., in opening the Council, states the first object to be the reformation of the church; of the abominations existing therein he complains, and calls upon the bishops to aid in removing them. His expressions are stronger than most that you have quoted, but he restricts them to real, he does not extend them to imaginary abuses; and exhorts the prelates strenously to flee avarice, uncleanness, and ambition, to practise prayer and mortification, and to cultivate the virtues.

I should wish much to have the opportunity of giving here, in full, the canons to which I refer; but I must now be content with giving their substance. The sixty-second condemns and forbids the sale of relics, and warns the bishops against allowing lying stories or false documents to be exhibited, to make a gain by procuring offerings from pious persons who are deluded.

It then proceeds to warn them against the easy admission of questors, some of whom had been found, even in their summonses, sustaining abuses by the assertion of falsehoods; and gives the form of the letters which the Holy See gave to those whom it sent out, which is but a general exhortation to alms-giving in favour of some special charitable or religious institution that is in distress, with an assurance that God will bestow an abundant reward. It desires that they shall not be permitted to publish more than their commission expresses; and desires that bishops shall not give any other sort of commission. It proceeds:

"Let those who are sent to seek alms be modest and discreet, let them not lodge in taverns or unbecoming places; let them not incur useless or high expenses, and let them be cautious that they do not wear the dress of an order to which they do not belong."

"And because the prelates of some churches do not fear so to act as that, by their grants of indiscreet and superfluous indulgences, both the jurisdiction of the church is brought into contempt, and penitential satisfaction is enervated,—the decree," and so forth.

Great restrictions are specified, and a great moderation enjoined upon the example given by the Pope.

The next canon notices "extortions and filthy and base exactions," for the performance of several clerical duties; and notices their being taxed at certain rates (not in the Roman Chancery, nor in Rome, nor for

sins, but elsewhere); it condemns and reprobates it as a simoniacal corruption, ordering it to be abolished.

The sixty-fifth recites the allegation against some bishops who refused to institute pastors until they got money, and made other extortions. They are condemned, the exactions prohibited, and the criminal is bound to pay double the amount of the exaction to the injured place or party.

The next canon would be rather inconvenient to some Protestant churches in this city; and one was passed in stronger language at Triburia, condemning extortions for services, and so forth, at the burial of the dead, and on other occasions. The German Council, in canon xvi., calls it "a custom to be abhorred and avoided by all Christians, that of selling for a price the sepulture due to the dead." What would they say to fifty dollars for leave to bury a corpse?

This, however, is a disgression, and one which I cannot now afford to follow up. My object was to show that, although the abuses in granting indulgences increased to an alarming extent at this period, the legislative body of the church neither countenanced nor defended the abuse, nor was it negligent in the reprehension; but it had not power to prevent what it condemned. At this council there sat the patriarchs of Constantinople and of Jerusalem, seventy Greek and Latin archbishops, and four hundred and twelve bishops, besides a large number of abbots and other dignitaries.

I shall now give from the *Corpus Juris Canonici* (Clem. lib. v. tit. ix. c. 2) the decree of Pope Clement V. upon the subject, according to the proceedings of the Council of Vienne in Dauphiny, where upwards of three hundred bishops were assembled in 1311. The title of the decree is *Abusionibus.*

"Desiring (as far as lies in my power) to present the abuses which some questors of alms put forward in their preachings, that they may deceive the simple, and extort gold from them by subtle, or rather by deceitful ingenuity; since it tends to the danger of souls, and the scandal of very many;—we have thought fit, according to the statute of the general council, strictly to prohibit (unless they should produce the letters of the Holy See, or of their diocesan bishop) that they should be in any way admitted or permitted to preach (for their duty is solely to state to the people the indulgences granted to them, and suppliantly to request from them their charitable aid), and to prohibit their being allowed to explain to the people anything more than what may be contained in the aforesaid letters. And let the diocesan bishop, diligently examine

the apostolic letters, lest there should be any fraud in them, before they admit the questors themselves."

"Moreover, some of these questors, as have been brought to our knowledge, not without great impudence of temerity and multiplied deceit of souls, actually grant of their own motions indulgences to the people, dispense in vows, absolve those who confess to them from perjuries, homicides, and other sins; remit doubtful claims and restitution for thefts (upon a certain sum of money being given to themselves,) remit a third or a fourth part of the penances enjoined; take out from purgatory (as they falsely and lyingly assert) three or more souls of the relations or friends of those who give them alms, and carry them to the joys of paradise, give them a full indulgence and remission of their sins to the benefactors of those places for which they request, and some of them (to use their own words) absolve from guilt and punishment."

"Now, we desiring in every way to abolish abuses of this description, by means whereof ecclesiastical censures are made vile and the authority of the keys of the church is brought into contempt, strictly forbid those things to be done or attempted in future by any questors, altogether revoking by apostolic authority, all and singular privileges, if any there were given in the premises or any of them to any places or to any persons or orders of questors, or to any of them in any manner, lest in pretence or pretext thereof there may seem ground for their farther presumption."

The latter clauses of the decree state that the number of questors and the abuses have increased, and call upon the bishops to punish the delinquents and check the abuses.

It is curious to notice that the very evil complained of, the very abuses condemned, and the deceit denounced, are, by the early Protestant writers, attributed to the very tribunal which denounced and condemned and sought to remove them! These efforts were made before that period at which you allege the formation of the taxes under John XXII., the immediate successor of this very Clement! I wish, sir, I had room to give in this place the exhibition of the sentiments of some of our best and most active and enlightened writers, high not only in public estimation for piety and literature and every quality which could adorn the human character, but also high in ecclesiastical rank, who bewail and condemn those abuses whilst they vindicate the fair fame of the church and sustain her doctrines; but it is too soon, and for me the opportunity exists not of giving their testimony to a well-disposed people, long habituated to attribute every enormity to the See of Rome,—long taught to seek for the origin of every religious

evil in the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church. I am also forced thus to pass over the intermediate period, during which I could show the acts of many other councils, and come down to that which you call the day of reformation. The questors still existed, and some of our best writers say that even the Holy See became too careless in correcting the abuses to which I have alluded. I have at all events shown that they existed and were widely spread abroad. And now we come to the days of Tetzel, as the commissioner of Rome. That his questors were guilty of many of the faults into which the others fell, I am prepared to admit as more than probable. That several of the allegations made against them by the earliest Protestant writers were notoriously untrue, I think I am prepared, if necessary, to prove. But, sir, in this I believe we should differ. I am of opinion that their crimes were not as great as were the calumnies of their opponents. I do not attempt to defend the one; you attempt to vindicate the other. I have before my eye assertions of the fathers of the religious disunion: assertions that the canon laws contained enactments which the Catholic writers of that day denied to have ever been found upon the books, and which certainly do not appear upon the copies ancient or modern in either of the Protestant or Catholic collections of this day; and thus, sir, though not one of them refers to the *Tax-book* of the Roman Chancery for such a statute as you have described, they have similar ingenious devices.

The Council of Trent had the case necessarily under its consideration. Several of the Catholic nations remonstrated against the crimes of the questors, who even still existed, and in the fifth session, held on the 17th June, 1546, the last clause agreed to in the second chapter on reformation, was—

"Let not the questors of alms, commonly called *quæsturaii*, of whatever condition they may be, presume, in any way, to preach, either by themselves or by another, and let the bishops and ordinaries of the places banish, by all proper means and remedies, those who contravene this decree, notwithstanding any privileges."

And again, in the twenty-first session, held July 16, 1562; Chapter IX. on Reformation—

"Since many remedies heretofore had recourse to, by different councils, as well of Lateran as of Lyons, and of Vienna, against the wicked abuses of questors of alms, have been latterly found useless; and since their malice seems daily rather to increase, together with the great scandal and complaint of the faithful; so that there no longer appears to be any hope of their amendment, it (the council) decrees

that henceforth, in all places of the Christian religion, their name and their use be perfectly and fully abolished, and that no one shall henceforth be admitted in any way to exercise this office, notwithstanding any privileges, churches, monasteries, hospitals, pious places, or any grants thereto, or to any persons of what degree soever or state or dignity granted, and notwithstanding customs even immemorial, and it decrees that indulgences and other spiritual graces, of which it is not fit that the faithful of Christ should be deprived, shall henceforth be published by the ordinary of the place, to the people, at the proper time, associating with him two members of the chapter, to whom also power is given for faithfully collecting the alms and the charitable aids offered to them, they receiving no reward in any manner. So that at length all may know that these treasures of the church are used for piety and not for gain."

The abuses have since disappeared, and there never was a period when there was a more general and pious use made of indulgences, than at the present time, and yet abuses are scarcely found and seldom complained of.

The dispensations were also frequently given without sufficient examination, and it was charged by some of our best and most pious men, that the facility was so great, from the avarice of the officers, that no person who sent the fees for the papers, and a sufficient compensation for the Datary, could have any reasonable doubt but that the ingenuity of the officers would work the application to a favourable issue, sooner than they should lose the fees which would accrue from the passing of the grant.

In like manner it was complained that it needed only the expression of sorrow, which was too often feigned, and the payment of the fees for drawing the papers, to procure an absolution from censures, and that what was originally intended as a check upon misconduct, became, by the facility by which it could be removed, rather a fixed rate at which a person might have the grounds furnished for a calculation of the yearly cost of getting relieved from censures and continuing to incur them. But it must be recollected that all this was in the exterior courts: and had no concern with sins, but with censures. The tribunal was established not for the license of transgressors, but for the punishment and their release from a state of disgrace and restraint, after their amendment. The facility of the tribunal may be proof of the infidelity of its officers to their duty, but was no proof that sin was sanctioned by the church: and this tribunal had no concern with the remission of sin, but the removal of censure, and if fines were sometimes paid, they

were inflictions for the past, not purchase money for the future. That the money thus procured might have been occasionally misapplied, I will not venture to doubt; but the history of the past and the results which I have witnessed, have proved to me that it was destined to the highest objects of religion, of literature, of civilization and of charity, in the erection of churches, the endowing of colleges, the support of missions, the alleviation of sickness, the support of orphans, and the relief of the poor. Notwithstanding the speculations which occasionally existed, sir, I venture to assert that no one of your societies has had its funds more faithfully administered.

These days and these practices, sir, have passed away; and the improvement which took place in the Catholic Church was a reformation of the practices of individuals and of some tribunals. Its necessity was pointed out by proper officers of the church itself, and by the voice of Catholic Europe. It was effected without a change of her doctrine or a separation in her communion, though large bodies did separate and make doctrinal changes: and during a long period, unfortunately, there were sufficient abuses to call for reprehension, without the necessity of interpolation or forgery, at the very moment that remedy had been efficiently applied.

In addition to the other observations, allow me to add this one before I conclude. You will find upon the Index, as censured, the books which proclaim as genuine most of those indulgences and dispensations which are the theme upon which every tyro in Protestant theology founds his charges, to exhibit the corruptions of our church. What, sir, would you think of my honesty, did I pick up every book which you flung away as a libel, and impute its expressions to yourself?

I would that you read a little more of Catholic authors than you appear to have done, and after viewing both sides you may, perhaps, think differently from what you do.

In what estimation do we hold those travellers who, in order to amuse Europe and fill their own purses, compile volumes turning our peculiarities into ridicule whilst they suppress the exhibition of those things in which we excel? What do you think of those "friends of humanity," who collect a few anecdotes of the misconduct of some unfeeling masters and embellish the narrative from the stores of fancy, thus to portray the southern planter? Of what value would be a history of the United States whose contents should be even a faithful transcript of the records of our criminal courts?

And, sir, if a foreigner were to form his estimate of our public men and of the administration of our affairs from the vituperation

and the falsehoods of our party press, and refer to public American writers as the authorities by which he was guided, would you call him a well-informed man? You have read the history of the Catholic Church in this way, or I am in error.

I am fatigued, sir, and probably so are you and my readers. I shall only say, that when you had Bayle you had all that the libraries of Europe could have furnished to sustain you. I know not whether any reply that you may make shall render it necessary for me to appear upon this subject again. Whether it should or not, I wish to preserve for you the feelings which I have more than once expressed, and beg leave to remain, reverend sir,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

BEAUFORT, S. C., Sept. 10, 1839.

To the Right Reverend Bishop England:

Reverend Sir—I have read your last five letters with all the attention in my power. I, with deference, conceive that the proofs and arguments in my communications remain not only unscathed, but quite untouched as to any material point, and that I could easily show this. The controversy has, however, been already protracted to such a weary length, that it would be unreasonable, if not impossible, to trespass farther on the patience of our readers. I am sure the greatest favour I can confer upon the public, is to terminate the discussion, and I submit the case, therefore, cheerfully to the verdict of all who seek only truth—making but the following observations, which they will see indispensable:

1. You must feel that expurgated copies of tax-books and other documents in your possession, are worth less than nothing in the case before us.

2. When Abbe Richard admits the *Tax-book*, it is the work "Jurieu produced," viz.: the tariff of sin which he says "the Church"[36] suppressed, and of which "the guilt belongs only to the Court of Rome." Your attempt to identify this with the cut and dry copy in your possession, and to confound a *Tax-book* for papal revenue with a fee-bill of officers, is too bad. The picture you give, however, of John XXII.,

[36] If I repeat often, these words, you will forgive me. I am an unworthy member of a poor and humble body of Dissenters, and I cannot quite forget that witty, but wicked, sarcasm of South's: "The Baptists have a church, but no religion; the Dissenters a religion, but no church." You will, sir, sympathize with me, no doubt, and participate in my indignation.

"citing Scripture for his purpose," is admirable. How the blood-sucker must have chuckled, as he concocted his infernal scheme for replenishing his needy coffers, and "gave as a cause (your own words) that verse of the Psalmist—'Blessed is he who understandeth concerning the needy and the poor.'" Well done Pone John XXII.

3. Your *Indices Prohibitorum*, and *Nisi corriganturs*, clearly proves nothing, but that the press was, and is abused shamefully in order to conceal truth, and keep the people in ignorance and superstition. As you are so anxious for an exhibition, I beg you will only go as far back as 1826, and let the community see the Index then published, and the books it forbids, and the conditions on which alone even the Bible is to be allowed.

4. In respect to the Chancery, you say you "have other dodging places," and I "have not got you there." I think I have; and I am satisfied of it even by your last letters. The preparing a *Tax-book* would be only a "ministerial act" and not "judicial." The Popes themselves were the authorities which issued indulgences. They palmed them upon the people as absolutions and dispensations from censures and sins; and the "ministerial" business of preparing the tariff would belong to the Chancery. As to the refinements of the church and Bellarmine, I care nothing. The distinction may be very clear in your articles of faith between absolutions, and dispensations, and indulgences: but the word of God condemns them all without any distinction; and what would Popes like John, and Sixtus, and Leo, care about the subtleties and maxims of Doctor Tom Aquinas? They had but one orthodox maxim:

> *O cives, cives, quaerenda pecunia primum est,*
> *Virtus post nummos.*
> Get moneys, moneys, fleece our flock of these;
> And then—old Tom of Aquin, if you please.

As, however, you might go on dodging for ever in those courts, let a single, plain, but decisive question suffice. Is it even possible that you can be correct, and all the Protestant princes, and the multiplied European authorities cited—Reformed and Romanist?—be in error? Sir, Lingard has betrayed you into adopting, for argument, what even he only meant as a spiteful retort upon Mesurier, Faber, and the other archers, who galled and shot him without mercy.

5. You acknowledge one error as to Parrhasius, and commit others. That "Protestant translation" of Bayle, which you use, must labour sadly under the "peculiar disease," and were Whittaker living, it could

hardly escape him. Leave it, sir, and go to the honest original "kindly offered" you. The case was incest from first to last. The Pope did sell a dispensation; *l'argent a quoi la dispense etait taxée.* That it was not an indulgence, but a dispensation from sin, makes my argument stronger; since the Datary had to do with a dispensation from incest; and I maintain that, though seperate now, the Datary and Chancery were then the same court. In a note to Mosheim (v. 3, p. 93,) the learned Schlegel gives an account of the courts, and says "the Chancery is called Dataria." This was as late as 1770. Parrhasius died two centuries before, in 1533. Even now, you admit, that while the Datary inquires into cases of incest, the Chancery "prepares the papers and gives the documents," viz., the Datary is judicial; the Chancery ministerial; and preparing the *Tax-book* would be ministerial. But, sir, without farther jugglery, why not put the thing in its true light at once? Indulgences, absolutions, and so forth, were granted by no tribunals at all, but by the Pope himself. As to these, the courts of Rome deserve not the name of tribunals. They were and are mere creatures of the Pontiff: and to whatever department he might choose to refer certain matters for investigation or report, the Chancery (an office derived from the Cæsars, see Black. *Comm.*) was, and would be, the ministerial bureau to issue his tariff of taxes. I am willing, however, to rest this on the simple, plain question put above.

6. You are "astonished at my inaccuracy as to the date of the protest of the princes." I am astonished at yours. The Council of Trent was called as early as 1542. Even before 1546, the princes presented their memorial. In January, 1546, Robertson says, (p. 147,) "they published a long manifesto, containing a renewal of their protest, against its (the Council of Trent's) meeting together, with the reasons which induced them to decline its jurisdiction." The meeting in 1562, was only a reassembling of the same council, and the address of the princes a representation of their protest. Even this, however, was two years before Pinet's work. Your confession that, "as to Pinet's being the original fabricator, you are not so positive," indeed? and your suggestion that perhaps the whole body of princes were the forgers in a document publicly presented to a Catholic council! ! ! these are a specimen of the parts of your letters I had noted, as they came out, for comment; but, as to which, in sparing the public, I spare you. Would it not be safer and better to admit the *Tax-book*, among the "enormous and criminal abuses you grant did exist," than to hazard this charge? But so it is in these things; one step ever leads to worse; *Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coute.*

7. I said that "the enforcement of the tariff would have been a shelter in the days of Luther and Calvin." Here again, too, how exact the Prince William's illustration! The license laws exist now; but do they remedy the evil? Are they, or will they ever be, enforced, while they recognise the principle, that the manufacture of drunkards is an honest business, and sir, a proper subject for taxation?

8. As to the Lateran Council, I will give the words. The editors of the *Courier* threaten to put us on the advertising columns. I am not suprised at it. I return them my sincere acknowledgment for their courtesy, extended thus far to one who is a stranger, and whose name is not even on the list of their subscribers, (an omission which I beg they will supply.) But, sir, this threat must sound omniously in your ears; and, as I would fain save you from insolvency—for printing is rather harder and dearer work than pardoning sins, and the tax-bill of the *Courier* might not be quite so "extremely moderate" as that of the Pope appeared to honest Lingard—I will state to our readers, that I give the canon as quoted by Faber. His book, however, will satisfy any who consult it, that he drank not from troubled streams, but ascended to fountain heads; and G. S. Faber's reputation defies any assault: *Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta, sed potius perjuria, quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum venient instituta*; *Concil. Lateran.* tert. Can. XVI. Labb, *Concil. Sacrosanct.* vol· x. p. 1517." "For they (oaths) are not to be esteemed oaths but rather perjury, which are against ecclesiastical utility and the decisions of the holy fathers." (See Faber's *Diff.*, p. 48.) I find that Mr. Maclain, in his Mosheim, is at a loss, how this can be called the third Lateran Council, when there had been eight previously. He confounds Provincial with General councils. This was only the third General Lateran Council, and is acknowledged as the eleventh of those called Œcumenical or universal.

9. The prohibition of the tariff in 1570, and pretence of corruption, amounts, as Bayle well observes, only to this, "that the Pope wished to conceal a document with which at that time the Reformers were beginning to goad the church." The Jesuits were then the very soul of Inquisitions and Romanism. Pascal was indeed, "not of your church," if by "your church," you mean "the monastic order of the Jesuits." But he was a professor of the Roman Catholic religion; and, after my mention of his inimitable letters, I should have supposed you would hardly, however pressed, have brought forward the Jesuit Bellarmine. How largely, too, do you calculate on the ignorance of the community, when you quote a furious controversial tract of Lingard—that virulent

Roman Catholic priest whose prejudices make even his *History of England* unworthy of credit, full of "dexterity of interpolation," "wonderful talent for quoting as much as suits his purpose, and omitting whatever makes against him," "hardihood of assertion," "borrowing from his fancy what is necessary to the support of his system," and so forth, (*Edinb. Rev.* No. 83, 7.) It seems to be only against pretended Protestant forgeries, that your zeal, like veracious Whittaker's, is ungovernable. Lingard is, I believe, now living, and you might as well have given a passage out of one of your former letters. As you cite these works, however, (although the extracts are nothing at all to the purpose,) permit me to select one or two authorities, out of others before me, which bear directly on the "precise question,"—and which even you will not venture to combat—their words of themselves, ought to settle this dispute.

10. I adduced before the Nouvetaoin *Dictionary History* (Caen, 1786), whose editors, though violent Catholics mention Pinet's notes and the tariff, without the least pretence of forgery. These same editors speak in the highest terms of De Thou, (also a Roman Catholic,) and what does he testify? "Leo X. gathered huge sums of money by sending his Breves abroad, everywhere, promising expiation of all sins, and life everlasting upon a certain price, which any should give according to the heinousness of his offence." (Thaun. *Hist. Sui. Temp.* ad ann. 1515.) Planck, than whom there is no better authority in Europe, and whose work the *Conversations Lexicon* pronounces distinguished "by profound research, and by thorough and free examination," thus writes: "In Rome itself, the trade in indulgences was prosecuted even in small and individual things, and carried on with a regularity which would have done honour to the most reputable business in the world. There was drawn up a formal statute regulating the prices of all kinds of sins, even of those, the very existence and names of which had, perhaps, been conceived of only in the imagination of some idle casuist; in which statute, the price of each pardon was fixed on the most singular principles of estimation. This almost incredible monument of the most audacious oppression, and blindest superstition, is still extant." (See *Taxa Sacræ Penitentiariæ* by Hortleder on the Causes of the German War, B. I. C. 47, p. 564 Planck *Prot. Theol.*)

I remarked in my last letter on your many random assertions. There is one I overlooked. It is this—"neither Mosheim nor any other respectable historian of the period alludes to such a document." Now here (as in your affirmations about Luther, "stricken out of Protestant books," "No gentleman, and so forth,") a plain man would take it for

granted, that you could hardly be speaking at a venture; and, at first, I really did not think to examine. Having grown a little wiser, however, I have turned to Mosheim, and lo! his words at page 430, verse 2. "The Popes not only sold indulgences to the people more frequently than formerly, to the great indignation of kings and princes, but they required enormous prices to be paid for their letters or bulls of every kind. In this thing John XXII. showed himself peculiarly adroit and shrewd, for, though he did not first invent the 'Regulations and fees of the Apostolic Chancery,' yet the Romish writers admit that he enlarged and reduced them to a more convenient form."

I have already referred to the note of his celebrated commentator Schlegel, who was a contemporary, giving a full account of the book of sin. Here is another decisive note by Schlegel. "There were rich merchants of Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburg, who purchased the indulgences for a particular province, and paid to the Papal Chancery handsome sums for them." verse 3, page 18. These wholesale importations, he says, they retailed at great profit.

As I am unwilling to multiply quotations unnecessarily, I give but one more. The *Biographie Universelle,* (the best biographical dictionary in the world) says, speaking of the tariff of sin (Art. Pinet): *La Taxe Chancellerie fut imprimèe pour la premiere fois a Rome en 1474, par l'ordre du Pape Sixtus IV.* John XXII. then enlarged and digested the tariff of iniquity in 1320; and Sixtus IV. first ordered it printed in 1474. This is just in keeping with the character of his Holiness Sixtus IV., who established brothels in Rome, in order to put a tax upon them. His other acts, and his consummate infamy, are they not written in the book of Agrippa: *de Vanit Scient,* and in every authentic history?

Now, sir, with these remarks, I acquiesce cheerfully in the decision of the public. Others crowd upon me, but I sacrifice them, though reluctantly; and, while "I do not ask a concession of victory"—about that I care nothing—I do ask a concession of truth. Let any man examine the proofs advanced, which are the best possible, from the nature of the case. Let him then look at the confessions of eminent Catholics. If farther corroboration be needed, let him inquire into the character of the Popes who are accused, and consider the notorious traffic in indulgences, which involves necessarily a fixed rate of prices; and if, after all this, he doubts the existence of the *Tax-book* of sin, I humbly submit that his scepticism must be ascribed not to any defect of testimony, but to some other cause.

I know nothing about the "mutual friend" in Charleston, who offered you the use of a copy of Bayle in the original—an offer which I

wish you had accepted—nor of any other "friend who had access to it;" but I cannot conclude, without expressing my sincere thanks to a gentleman and distinguished scholar, whose name you have mentioned, and whose acquaintance I enjoyed in former days, and amid scenes and pursuits, oh! how different from those in which my soul rejoices now—I allude to the Hon. H. S. Legare, who, while in Europe, purchased for the Beaufort College, not only Bayle, but by far the most choice collection of modern and ancient classics I have seen for a long time.

Allow me, also, reverend sir, now that this controversy is over, to repeat to you, and the members of your community, my regret that I have been forced into it, and that, in order to defend the Prince William's committee, and show the striking accuracy of their comparison, I have been compelled to disinter and expose the enormities, which I had hitherto been willing to leave buried in oblivion, and for doing which, I can only say—as I remarked in my first note, deprecating this discussion—that "upon yourself must rest the blame."

I despatch the above, before your promised explanations and confessions have reached me. After the premonitory of the *Courier*, I am unwilling to expose you to temptation, by entering on a subject which, by the bye, you carefully evaded while the press was open, and the public patience not exhausted. Reverend sir, I anticipate fully your course of argument as to absolutions, indulgences, and so forth. But all ingenuity here is expended in vain. The word of God levels against the whole system its distinct and unequivocal denunciation, and it is notorious that the Popes cared no more for your theories than I do, when they wanted money. That there were men who lifted an unavailing cry against the existing abuses, I well know—although poor Jerome and Huss teach us what was their reward. But, if your confessions shall merit the title—if they prove not a mere confirmation of Massilon's remark, that "the confessions of most persons are only a studious arrangement of words, to soften and embellish," and so forth, *l'arrangement etudie des expressions qui adoucissent l'horreur*, and so forth—if, in short, you acknowledge one thousandth part of what all history attests—then, you must admit abominations so ineffably and infinitesimally enormous, that our judges will be amazed at your indignation about the *Tax-book*; and, while they look in horror at the character of your clients —priests, abbots, bishops, cardinals, popes, councils, and the whole church, century after century—they will unanimously turn to me, and exclaim, in the language of an old acquaintance of yours at school: *Solventur risu tabulæ—tu missus abibis.*

Hoping, then, we may now "part in mutual respect and amity," I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

RICHARD FULLER.

Note.—The editors of the *Courier* gave notice, that as the correspondence was voluminous, and might be very long, they should charge for it as an advertisement, if continued.

BROAD STREET, Sept. 14, 1839.

To the Editors of the Charleston Courier.

Gentlemen:—I send a letter in reply to the Rev. R. Fuller, which, though it is only the vindication of a council from the worst accusation he could bring forward, and which appeared in your paper, I shall pay for as an advertisement, upon the presentation of your bill. You will add to the favours conferred, by giving it a conspicuous place.

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

To the Rev. Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—I am satisfied to close the discussion relating to the "Statute formerly passed by the Roman Chancery, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each may be committed," with but three remarks.

1. Though De Thou professed the Catholic religion, he was generally considered to be more friendly to its opponents; and his history has been censured at Rome, by a decree of November 9, 1609, and subsequently by one of May 10, 1757. A modern writer describes him as *Audax nimium*: *hostis Jesuitarum implacabilis*: *calumniator Guisiorum*: *protestantium exscriptor, laudator, rei Catholicæ parum æquus*: "Too bold: an implacable enemy of the Jesuits: the calumniator of the Guises, the transcriber, the panegyrist, the friend of the Protestants: unjust to the Holy See, to the Council of Trent, and to the whole of what regards Catholicism." The documents which he used were furnished by the most violent enemies of the Catholic religion, and the leading writers of the party naturally extolled the historian who became little more, upon the subject of religion, than their amanuensis.

2. I wrote that Mosheim does not allude to such a document as "the *Tax-book*," or "the Statute formerly passed by the Roman Chan-

cery, making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the prices at which each might be committed.'' The quotation that you make is no allusion to either. I always admitted that there was a *Tax-book* or fee-bill of the Chancery, but I denied that it contained the items of your tariff; and it is still my untouched assertion, that Mosheim does not allude to them, nor to any of them. You say that Planck does, and I give you the full benefit of his assertion.

3. ''Sixtus IV. established brothels in Rome, in order to put a tax on them.'' I am sorry that you should have so far forgotten yourself as to repeat this scandalous libel, and to make reference to Agrippa, who is thus well described: *Nullis hic parcit: contemnit, scit, nescit, flet, ridet, irascitur, carpit omnia. Ipse philosophus, dæmon, heros, deus et omnia.*—''He spares no one: he despises, knows, knows not, weeps, laughs, is angry, attacks, finds fault with everything. Himself a philosopher, a devil, a hero, a god, and everything.'' By how many was he caressed, and then turned off? In how many countries has he been a beggar? How many patrons has he assailed? How many prisons has he graced with his presence? You are angry with the Popes, but it would be well to have discretion even in anger!

I, however, must give you and our readers a little more of the canon of the Council of Lateran than you vouchsafed to give them upon the authority of Faber. Your charge was, that the council made perjury in behalf of the church a virtue, and you added that the council made falsehood in behalf of the church a virtue. Your words were:

''But without saying a word about the notorious Third Lateran Council, which makes not only falsehood but perjury a virtue in behalf of the church,—omitting that, you will permit me, respectfully, to ask one question.''

I do not know, sir, whether any of the blood of my native country flows in your veins; but if not, you are quite worthy of being admitted into our honourable fraternity, for you have made an admirable bull in saying what you did not say a word about, and omitting what you stated!

Amongst Catholics, sir, perjury is the violation of a lawful oath, or the taking of an unlawful oath. Thus, if we swear to declare the truth and do not declare it, it would be perjury; and should a man attempt to bind me by the form of an oath to declare a falsehood, I would be guilty of perjury in going through the form which I profaned; but not only am I not compelled by this form to tell a lie, but I am obliged to go against the words by which I appeared to be bound, because it is no

oath, but a perjury. An oath cannot be a bond of iniquity. A conspirator who has sworn with his fellows to commit robbery or murder is not bound by the oath. In fact it is no oath; to be an oath, it must have three qualities, viz.: truth, judgment, and justice; the defect of either renders it no oath.

There are some acts bad in themselves—such as injustice, murder, and so forth. We believe that it is always perjury for a person to swear that he will commit either of them, and that there is in such cases no oath, but a deceptive form which is no bond, and that the moral obligation is against its observance.

Other acts may be legalized by society, or by its representative, the legislature; and we may be bound by an oath to their performance. Thus, a sheriff is bound by his oath to execute the sentences of the court of justice. In this case he may be released from the obligation by the same tribunal by which it was created. A custom has been long observed, and has been legally sanctioned: by virtue thereof certain duties are to be performed by particular officers: they are sworn to the performance; the legislature finds that the custom has been perverted, and enacts a law for its reformation, and declares that they who have been sworn to perpetuate the abuse are not prohibited by their oaths from observing the law, but that they are bound to obey it; for that a semblance of an oath which prevents the reformation of abuses is no oath, because it wants the qualities of "judgment and of justice." Would you call this perjury? Were the fathers of the revolution who had sworn allegiance to the crown of Great Britain perjurers, because they issued the Declaration of Independence?

Now, sir, the canon xvi. of the third Council of Lateran, was an act of the legislature of the church, remedying a glaring abuse, and declaring that even persons who might have sworn to its perpetuation were not bound to continue the abuse, by reason of having so sworn; for an oath against the public good was not an oath.

Canon XVI. Cum in cunctis ecclesiis, quod pluribus et senioribus fratribus visum fuerit, incunctanter debeat observari: grave nimis et reprehensione est dignum, quod quarumdam ecclesiarum pauci quandoque non tam de ratione quam de propria voluntate ordinationem multoties impediunt, et ordinationem ecclesiasticam procedere non permittunt. Quocirca presenti decreto statuimus, ut nisi a paucioribus et inferioribus aliquid rationabile fuerit ostensum: appellatione remota, semper prævaleat et suum consequatur effectum quod a majori et seniori parte capituli fuerit constitutum. Nec nostram constitutionem impediat, si forte aliquis ad conservandam ecclesiæ suæ consuetudinem juramento se

dicat adstrictum. Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta sed potius perjuria quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta. Si autem hujus modi consuetudines, quo ratione juvantur et sacris congruant institutis, irritare, præsumpserit: donec congruam egerit pœnitentiam, a Dominici corporis perceptione fiat alienus.

"Whereas, in all churches, that which is approved of by the more numerous and the older brethren ought to be observed without hesitation; it is grievous and reprehensible that in some churches, a few persons frequently hinder an ordinance, not so much upon reasonable cause as by their self-will; and do not permit the ecclesiastical ordinance to proceed. Wherefore, we enact by this present decree, that unless some reasonable cause be shown by the minority and the younger, that which shall have been regulated by the majority and the elder portion of the chapter shall, all appeal being taken away, always prevail and have its effect. Nor let it be a hindrance to our regulation, that perchance any one should say that he is bound by an oath to preserve the customs of his church. For they are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are in opposition to the welfare of the church and the enactments of the holy fathers. And if any person shall presume to make void customs of this description, which are sustained by reason, and according to the sacred regulations, let him be denied the partaking of the body of the Lord until he shall have done befitting penance."

Thus, sir, I have copied and translated the canon from the volume and page of the work you pointed out, and I leave to my readers to decide whether by quoting from the law the miserable scrap which I have extracted above, Mr. Faber has enabled you to convict three hundred Catholic bishops, representing their whole church, in the year 1179, of having taught, 1st, That falsehood was a virtue when committed on behalf of the church; 2d, That perjury was a virtue when committed on behalf of the church.

Now, sir, I apprehend the Protestant princes who made it a condition for their acknowledgement of the council which they affected to seek, that the prelates should be declared not bound by their oaths, would feel little obliged to you or to Mr. Faber, did you charge them with legalizing perjury.

I shall also, sir, refer you, instead of quoting Catholic authorities, for which you have such becoming contempt, to Paley, chapter xxi., Oaths to observe local statutes, where he describes the observance to be in some cases unlawful, and says: "Unlawful directions are countermanded by the authority which made them unlawful." This, sir, is the very case. The highest legislative authority in the society, made the bad

custom, which was an unreasonable deviation from the original correct usage, unlawful,—and after this the oath became unlawful.

As you seem kindly to feel for my poverty, I must own that even, with that poverty I have some pride. I therefore wish to make the best figure that I can, by paying for at least this one communication, which I make as brief as possible, not to run the risk of the insolvency from which you would fain save me. I need not remind you, sir, that picking lines out of law books is a dangerous occupation.

I have the honour to remain,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 16, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Sir:—I had hoped that my letter in the *Courier* of this morning would have rendered it unnecessary for me to add anything in reply to your last. But by some mischance in the office, the passage in the canon and its translation which I marked in italics, were not so printed; and in place of referring to the words printed as I marked, the reference was changed to "the miserable scrap which I have extracted above," when I made no extract. And thus the force of my argument was so far lessened as to be scarcely intelligible. As I feel it necessary to remedy this error or mistake, I have determined now to make the argument as plain as I can.

The case stands thus. On the 23d of August, you wrote the following passage:

"But without saying a word about the notorious third Lateran Council, which makes not only falsehood, but perjury a virtue in behalf of the church."

In this you make two distinct charges against that council. First.—That it made falsehood a virtue in behalf of the church. Second.—That it made perjury a virtue in behalf of the church.

I was so totally unprepared for such charges, that I requested you to enlighten me upon the subject. And on the 10th of September, you give me, as your authority for the two charges, "the canon as quoted by Faber," and you assure me that "his book however will satisfy any one who consults it, that he drank not from troubled streams, but ascended to the fountain head: and G. S. Faber's reputation defies any assault." After this glorious flourish, you give the quotation which the

editors of the *Courier* thus print in italics, and within inverted commas, as I suppose you so marked them for exhibition: *Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta sed potius perjuria quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam, et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta. Concil. Lateran.* tert. can. xvi. Labb. *Concil. Sacrosanct.* vol. x. p. 1517." And to this you add the translation: "For they (oaths) are not to be esteemed oaths, but rather perjury, which are against ecclesiastical utility and the decisions of the holy fathers." (See Faber's *Diff.* p. 48.)

Now, sir, I shall not charge the garbling of the canon upon you. I shall give its discredit to G. S. Faber, whose "reputation defies any assault." Perhaps I am in error when I believe you to have been innocent, as not having read any more of the canon than was furnished to you by G. S. Faber—but for your own sake, I hope, as I believe, that I am right.

From this extract of the canon, for it is no more, I now ask you to show how you prove that the council taught "that falsehood was a virtue in behalf of the church."

You cannot show it, and thus, sir, you stand before the public making an accusation of the most grievous nature against the highest tribunal of the Catholic Church, without even the shadow of one particle of evidence to sustain your charge. You have not produced even a forged or an interpolated, or a garbled document to give it the semblance of a support: for even in this garbled morsel, which Faber gave you, there is nothing on which you can found the allegation. The whole statement respecting falsehood then emanates, to speak in the mildest terms, from your imagination. You have in many places of your letters given ample provocation for my treating you here in a way to which I will not have recourse.

Now, as to the charge that the council "made perjury a virtue on behalf of the church."

Suppose the garbled scrap which Faber gives from the sixteenth canon to be a fair representation of the meaning of that law, what does it say? That oaths taken against the utility of a public body, then known as the aggregate of the civilized world, and believed by the bulk of Christendom to be the Church established by Christ to lead man to salvation, are not oaths—but perjuries. Would an oath taken by a citizen of our state against its public welfare be considered obligatory? Would the court, which should decide that the citizen who took it and continued to adhere to it was not bound by that oath, upon the ground that it was not an oath, but perjury, be justly accused of teaching that perjury was lawful? I need not inform you that the first obligation

of every citizen is the law of God: the second is the constitution of his state, and as no form of oath could bind him to the violation of the divine law, so, except the constitution of his state should conflict with the divine law, no form of oath could bind him to violate that constitution: and should there be such a conflict, he is bound to the state in every other point save that in which the conflict exists: and his exemption in this instance arises from that sound maxim of legal interpretation that where two laws are in irreconcilable conflict, that of the first or higher authority must prevail. These are the principles which I have been taught from Roman Catholic authors, by Roman Catholic professors: they are the principles which I find recognised in all enactments and interpretations of councils in the Roman Catholic Church, from the Council of Jerusalem held by the Apostles down to the present day.

Faber does not translate *sanctorum patrum instituta.* You give as the translation, "the *decisions* of the holy fathers." I translated it in my letter of Saturday, "*enactments* of the holy fathers." To you, a learned jurist, it is quite unnecessary for me to dwell upon the palpable distinction between an *enactment* which is a legislative act, and a *decision* which is the judicial interpretation of that enactment. I looked into a couple of Latin dictionaries in order to be assured that my recollection was correct, and they gave me, "statute, order, decree." I looked into Johnson, for the word "institute"—and he referred me to the Latin "*institutum,*" giving as the meaning "established law: settled order." I was quite aware that throughout the canon law, the word "*institutum*" was used for "enactment," and "*interpretatio*" for "decision." Thus, even the garbled quotation of Faber, would convey this meaning, "the council taught that oaths, taken against the enactments of the holy fathers," that is, against the public and well-known laws of the society, "were not oaths but perjuries." And would not every court of our state also declare that oaths taken against the public enactments of the Legislature were not oaths, but perjuries?

Now, sir, I suspect that not one reflecting person who reads this will believe that you had one particle of evidence, even in that garbled extract, upon which to sustain your very cruel and outrageous charge.

Again, I must remedy the occurrence in the printing office, and to render my argument intelligible, here insert the canon.

Canon XVI. *Cum in cunctis ecclesiis, quod pluribus et senioribus fratribus visum fuerit, incunctanter debeat observari: grave nimis et reprehensione est dignum, quod quarumdam ecclesiarum pauci quandoque non tam de ratione quam de propria voluntate ordinationem multoties impediunt, et ordinationem ecclesiasticam procedere non per-*

mittunt. Quocirca prasenti decreto statuimus, ut nisi a paucioribus et inferioribus aliquid rationabile fuerit ostensum: apellatione remota, semper prevaleat et suum consequatur effectum quod a majori et seniori parte capituli fuerit constitutum. Nec nostram constitutionem impediat, si forte aliquis ad conservandam ecclesiæ suæ consuetudinem juramento se dicat adstrictum. Non enim dicenda sunt juramenta sed potius perjuria, quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam et sanctorum patrum veniunt instituta. *Si autem hujus modi consuetudines, quo ratione juvantur et sacris congruant institutis, irritare, præsumpserit: donec congruam egerit pœnitentiam, a Dominici corporis perceptione fiat alienus.*

"Whereas, in all churches, that which is approved of by the more numerous and the older brethren ought to be observed without hesitation: it is grievous and reprehensible that in some churches, a few persons frequently hinder an ordinance, not so much upon reasonable cause as by their self-will: and do not permit the ecclesiastical ordinance to proceed. Wherefore we enact by this present decree, that unless some reasonable cause be shown by the minority and the younger, that which shall have been regulated by the majority and the elder portion of the chapter shall, all appeal being taken away, always prevail and have its effect. Nor let it be a hindrance to our regulation, that perchance any one should say that he is bound by an oath to preserve the custom of his church. *For they are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are in opposition to the welfare of the church, and the enactments of the holy fathers.* And if any person shall presume to make void customs of this description, which are sustained by reason, and according to the sacred regulations, let him be denied the partaking of the body of the Lord, until he shall have done befitting penance."

I now ask, whether the picking that morsel printed in *italics* out of the above canon, separating it from the context, and giving it as a proof that the third Lateran Council made not only falsehood, but perjury a virtue, in behalf of the church, is not dishonest garbling? I leave it to any honest man to say whether there is any essential moral difference between dishonest garbling and criminal interpolation; between criminal interpolation and forgery; between the notorious guilt of which G. S. Faber, "whose reputation defies any assault," stands convicted, and that which I have shown to be the crime of the Lord of Norroy, and the other interpolators of the *Tax-book*. I have had some little acquaintance with criminal courts: and I have more than once seen an accomplice produced as a witness to establish the innocence of his associate, by impeaching an innocent individual. But in those cases it was considered to be a desperate and reckless effort injudiciously

made, tending as it did to establish more fully the charge in the indictment.

I have the honour to remain, reverend sir,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT.

Reverend Sir:—You appeared to be so indignant at the insinuation that it was part and parcel of the system of the adversaries of the Roman Catholic Church and clergy to forge, to garble, and to malign, as well as to vituperate, that I thought it may, as you love truth, be useful, if not gratifying to you, that I should furnish a few facts in support of the assertion that such a system existed even at present. I was debating with myself whether I should not make selections for this purpose from a number of European and American journals, which from time to time I had laid aside to serve this purpose as occasion may require, and I have abundance; when this day's mail brought a new bundle of European papers. The first which I opened contained the following article, which I for the present submit to your perusal. Indeed, sir, were I to publish one-tenth of what I meet with in the course of a year, fitted to sustain my allegations, you may well calculate upon my insolvency. However, I can afford to pay for this; and as my fellow-citizens of other religious denominations would know little of it, were it confined to the columns of a Catholic periodical, I am desirous also of showing them that I generally do not hazard groundless assertions; and that, though I would libel the great bulk of Protestant Christians, were I to charge them with participating in this vile practice, yet I am ready to give abundant proof that it has been and continues to be the system of the violent opponents of the Roman Catholic Church, to have recourse to forgery, and fiction, and garbling, to defame that church and her clergy.

The *Cork Southern Reporter*, from whose columns of the 1st of last August, the following article is taken, is one of the most respectable journals of the United Kingdom. This article was published whilst the court in which the transaction occurred was yet in session in the city, and subsequent to the adoption of your memorial at Hoopsa church, on the 22d of July.

I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

THE LIMERICK LIBEL CASE [37]

CALUMNIES ON THE CATHOLIC CLERGY

We stated some reasons in our last number for the opinion we expressed—that however, in the spirit of forbearance, the Rev. Mr. Raleigh, the Roman Catholic curate of St. Nicholas' Chapel, Limerick, may have been satisfied with the apologies made to him on the previous day in open court, by the Rev· Dawson Massy, the Protestant curate of the same parish, and a Mr. Dartnell, proprietary of the *Limerick Standard,* the first for having furnished the material for, and the latter for having published an atrocious libel on his (Mr. Raleigh's) character, there were circumstances connected with that case, which convinced us that the ends of justice had not been arrived at by the result which had taken place, and we intimated our intention of giving a history of the case from the first appearance of the libel to what we cannot but consider its abortive adjustment. We stated that the slander was of a most atrocious nature; that it was persevered in until it was seen that the reverend plaintiff was determined to bring it before a jury of the country; that it was circulated through every part of the empire by the malignant industry of the tory journals; that it was a part and parcel of a system of falsehood and misrepresentation directed against the Catholic clergy; that if the action had been proceeded with, we had reason to believe that a piece of more villianously conceived defamation was never revealed to the public than would have been disclosed; but that, in consequence of the settlement which had taken place, nothing more would appear to the world than that an action was brought for an ordinary libel; that apologies were made by the author and publisher, and that these apologies were accepted; but that, as to the libel itself, no reference had been made to it, and that not one of the bad organs of the party which were too happy to circulate it, would recall the calumny. We deemed that all these circumstances were quite enough to take this case out of the ordinary rule of not noticing actions in which the parties have settled their difference between themselves, and promised that if in laying it before the public we should have to mix up or add to it other matter, it should be so far relative as to be illustrative of as heartless, profligate, and unprincipled a system of slander and calumny as was ever conceived in the bad minds of the worst conspirators against private character. We repeat the words which we used, and proceed to show their just and appropriate application to the disreputable and dishonourable practice which we denounce.

[37] The following letters on the Limerick Libel Case are from the *Cork Southern Reporter,* August 1st, 1839.

Some time ago—we think it was in the month of March—the *Cork Constitution* informed its readers that an order had been issued to the police, prohibiting them from furnishing the newspapers with accounts of murders, burnings, and the numerous other outrages which, according to the "state of the country" journals, were of such frequent occurrence. We stated at the time that we knew nothing of such an order, except upon the dubious authority of the *Constitution*; but that, if such a direction had been issued, we thought it would be attended with good effect, as it would probably curtail, in a great measure, the gross fabrications and exaggerated representations of the most trifling occurrences, which were sent before the public, to the great injury of the country. From that time forth, it was observable—indeed it was palpable to the most ordinary observer—that there was an almost total cessation in the "state of the country" journals of the usual accounts of outrages; and the space in them which used to be devoted to details of "horrid barbarities," which never took place, was necessarily filled with other matter. As the source from which they were accustomed to derive the ready made lies which answered their purpose was closed against them, they were thrown upon their own inventions, and upon altogether different contributors; and whereas, therefore, the subjects were "Murder, rape, robbery, arson," and so forth, the headings became—

"Ruffianly Conduct in Roman Catholic Chapels."

"Surpliced Ruffians."

"Ruffians in Sacerdotal Robes."

"Confession."

"Base Uses of the Confessional, and so forth, and so forth."

In the *Constitution* of the 6th April, appeared the following article, quoted as if copied from the *Limerick Chronicle*:

"RUFFIANLY CONDUCT IN ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPELS

"We have on many occasions remonstrated with our unthinking fellow-Protestants, on the idle and blamable curiosity which prompts them to enter Roman Catholic chapels, and view the disgusting mummeries and idolatry which are there perpetrated; but what remonstrance failed to effect, the following details of some occurrences which took place in this city on what the Roman Catholics call Holy Thursday evening, may ultimately accomplish.

"On that evening one of the annual shows which dazzle the ignorant, but which should disgust every well-educated person, takes place in the Roman Catholic chapels,—and the members of that persuasion, and we are sorry to add, some Protestants, from idle curiosity, visit the

chapels to see the decorations. Some Protestant ladies thus happened to enter one of the chapels in this city, and whilst there, a portion of the mummeries of the Romish Church required the prostration of the assembly. This the ladies could not do consistently, nor could they effect a retreat. At this moment the officiating priest called to them from the altar to kneel, but they did not comply with the request; on which he paused in the service, rushed from the altar, seized on the ladies, and, rudely dragging them to the door, pushed them out.

"In the Franciscan chapel, however, a circumstance of a far more ruffianly nature took place: a highly respectable lady entered—the same mummeries were being enacted, and the young lady, who, we believe, is an English lady and a Protestant, did not kneel like those around her. The moment she was perceived not to have done so, a cowardly ruffian in sacredotal robes rushed from the altar to where she stood, and grasping her by the arm, desired her to kneel. The lady said she was a Protestant, and would not do so for any one; on which the ruffian rudely pushed her, and she fell to the ground, he at the moment exclaiming, 'Now will you kneel?' In dreadful alarm the lady arose and exclaimed, 'Never;' on which the coward again pushed her to the ground, with all the fury of a demon depicted in his countenance.

"It is with gratification we state, that further violence was now stopped by the general outburst of indignation against a brute who could thus outrage an unprotected female; and seeing a rush being made from all quarters to protect her, the cowardly reptile returned abashed to the altar, and the lady was assisted from the chapel almost fainting.

"The last case is one of so dangerous a nature, that we sincerely hope the lady's friends will advise her to prosecute the ruffian. Justice demands that she should do so; but at any rate, we trust it will satisfy 'Liberal' Protestants, that the toleration to other creeds which is an essential of the Protestant faith, does not exist even in the Church of Rome."—*Limerick Chronicle.*

Not having, at the time we read this article in the *Constitution*, any recollection of having seen it in the *Limerick Chronicle*, we looked back to the past numbers of that paper, and, strange to say, it was never published in it. What the object of the *Constitution* was, in attributing the article to the *Chronicle*, we cannot imagine. But the article had appeared in the *Limerick Standard.* It was written on the authority of the Rev. Dawson Massy, the Protestant curate of St. Michael's church, Limerick; and it is the libel for which the Rev. Raleigh brought the action.

And if the statements made in it be not true; if, from beginning to

end, there was not the shadow of a foundation for them, or any one of them; if they were all a monstrous lie, conceived, in the first instance, in the most profligate disregard of truth and fact, and sought afterwards to be sustained by the vilest perjury, we ask of any man whose heart is not as black, and whose hands are not as deeply imbued in guilt as those of any of the parties to the infamous fabrication, can anything more depraved be imagined than the concoction of a story like this, having no other earthly object than to damage the character of a Catholic clergyman, no matter whether that clergyman was the curate of the Franciscan or of St. Michael's chapel, the great object being to injure the character of the body?

But let us proceed:

It appears that the Rev. Mr. Malone, the Catholic clergyman of the Franciscan chapel, having read the publication in the *Standard,* wrote a letter falsifying the statement altogether, so far as he or his convent was concerned. Of this letter we have no copy, nor ever saw one. It produced, however, the following from the Rev. Mr. Dawson Massy:

"Upper Mallow Street, April 8, 1839.

"*To the Editor of the Limerick Standard*:

"*Dear Sir*:—I have just seen the Rev. Mr. Malone's letter of this day, denying that any insult was offered at the Franciscan chapel to the Protestant ladies who atended it on Thursday evening before Easter.

"As I was the person who gave you the information to which Mr. M.'s letter alludes, I feel bound to substantiate its truth; and consequently called this evening on the young lady in question, to know the full particulars of the whole transaction.

"She solemnly affirms that she was treated with the utmost rudeness in a Roman Catholic chapel, on the evening you have mentioned, but in the Roman Catholic chapel of St. Michael's (not in the Franciscan), by the Rev. Mr. Raleigh, not by the Rev. Mr. Malone, and that your statement is substantially correct.

"The young lady naturally shrinks from giving her name to the public; but, as her parish minister, I have no hesitation in stating my conviction, that her testimony is worthy of credit; and I beg to add, that I myself would never mention the circumstance to you, but from my heartfelt desire that your noticing it in your widely circulated journal might deter Protestants from countenancing, by their presence, the erroneous rites of an impious idolatry, from the low motive of idle curiosity. The apprehension of meeting rudeness or insult in such places,

may keep away from them those whom a better principle does not control.

"I remain, dear sir, yours truly,

"DAWSON MASSY,

"Curate of the parish of St. Michael's, Limerick."

The charge being thus transferred from one clergyman to another, and the scene being laid in a different chapel, the Rev. Mr. Raleigh addressed a letter to the editor of the *Limerick Standard*, in reply to the Rev. Mr. Massy; but the *Standard* would not publish it, and he at length got it inserted in the *Limerick Chronicle*, with the accompanying introduction:

"SEXTON STREET, April 12.

"*To the Editor of the Limerick Chronicle*:

"*Sir*:—Having addressed the following letter to the editor of the *Limerick Standard*, in reply to one of the Rev. Dawson Massy, which appeared in that paper of the 8th inst., and as he has not inserted it, notwithstanding a promise made at a personal interview, I shall feel much obliged by your giving it a place in your columns on tomorrow, as I am particularly anxious that a moment should not elapse, without removing whatever imputation this reverend personage's letter may have cast upon me.

"I remain, sir, with great respect,

"Your obedient servant,

"JAMES RALEIGH."

"April 12.

"*To the Editor of the Limerick Standard*:

"*Sir*:—As you have declared yourself, in the last number of your paper, 'A lover of fair play,' I am induced to hope that you will not refuse to insert the few following lines:

"A leading article in your publication of the 5th inst. is headed—'Ruffianly conduct in two Roman Catholic chapels,' in which you assert that on last Holy Thursday evening, in a Roman Catholic chapel, in this city, a priest, or as you mildly call him, a 'ruffian in sacerdotal robes,' rushed from the altar, grasped the arm of a young lady, a Protestant and an Englishwoman, and with the fury of a demon depicted in his countenance, twice pushed her to the ground, exclaiming, 'now will you kneel.' It appears from the Rev. Mr. Malone's letter, that no such occurrence as that stated took place in the Franciscan, and at once in your last number the scenes are shifted, and St. Michael's chapel and

your humble servant are made the place and the party which must answer this imputed violence. You pronounce me the 'real delinquent,' and seem to rejoice that, with the assistance of the Rev. Dawson Massy, 'you have now put the saddle on the right horse.'

"I waited on this reverend personage yesterday, at his house, in company with a highly respectable Protestant citizen, to know from him the name of his informant, in order that I may disprove this odious imputation; and, contrary to every principle of manliness or justice, he refused my simple and reasonable request.

"It now, sir, only remains for me, in fairness to myself, to declare most solemnly that the whole transaction is a gross falsehood and a malicious fabrication; and, moreover, I pledge myself to the public to prove it to be such, the moment he declares his alleged informant.

"The Rev. Mr. Massy ought to know the commandment, 'Thou shalt not bear false witness,' and I would ask, is it consistent with justice, or with religious or moral principle, to publish 'his conviction of the truth' of a most painful and insulting statement against a Catholic clergyman, and then refuse the name of the person, from whom he asserts to have received it?

"In conclusion, sir, I beg to state, that unless the name of his informant be given, I shall take no further notice of this affair, but will give him the opportunity of proving, before another tribunal, the truth of this odious charge, for which he has avowed himself personally responsible.

"I remain, sir,
"Your obedient servant,
"JAMES RALEIGH, *V. P. St. Michael's.*"

Mr. Dawson Massy comes into the field again—not to reply to or notice the above letter of the Rev. Mr. Raleigh, but to confirm the statement made by himself in his published letter of the 8th; and to confirm it—how? By the affidavit of the young lady—"a Protestant and an Englishwoman" according to the original libel, "a young unprotected Protestant, and his parishioner," according to the Rev. Mr. Dawson Massy. But let that pass. In the *Limerick Chronicle*, of the 17th April, were the following letter and outrageous document—purporting to be the affidavit of some nameless affidavit lady.

"UPPER MALLOW STREET, April 16, 1839.

"*To the Editor of the Limerick Chronicle.*

"*Dear Sir*:—In confirmation of the statement made by me in my published letter of the 8th inst., I beg to furnish you with the following

copy of the affidavit of the injured person, the original of which is in my possession. As an humble follower of Him, who, when He was reviled, reviled not again, I abstain from angry recrimination.

"The public will draw their own conclusions from the accompanying document, and easily understand both the motive which influenced me in bringing the transaction before them, and the reason—the sole reason, of my having preserved from exposure the name of a highly respectable lady—a young, unprotected Protestant, and my parishoner.

"I remain, dear sir, yours truly,

"DAWSON MASSY,

"*Curator of St. Michael's.*"

(COPY.)

"County of the city of Limerick, to wit. } A. B. of C. D., in the county of the city of Limerick, spinster, came before me, and made oath on the holy Evangelists, that on the evening of Thursday, the 28th of March last, she, this deponent, accompanied by several other females, proceeded to St. Michael's chapel, situate in Denmark Street, in said city, for the purpose of witnessing the ceremonies of Holy Thursday.

"Saith, that on entering the chapel, she perceived two clergymen engaged at the altar, and shortly after, one of them, the younger of the two, whom deponent believes to be the Rev. James Raleigh, Roman Catholic curate of that parish, handed to the other officiating priest a silver vessel, which she has since heard contained what is called the Host.

"Saith that the elder priest proceeded onward from the altar, and was preceded by the younger, who, on coming up to where deponent was standing, called out to her, in a loud and angry voice, to kneel down, or immediately leave the chapel.

"Saith, that she, this deponent, answered him that she could not do so, and immediately heard the words 'bloody heretic,' and said Raleigh then pushed this deponent down on her knees.

"Saith, that as soon as she got up, she stated that 'if to be a Protestant was to be a bloody heretic, she was one,' and saith, that on recovering from the agitation induced by the harsh treatment she experienced, she saw the said Raleigh rudely pushing from the chapel another female, whom she knew to be a Protestant, and whom he put outside the door, and shut the same in her face.

"Saith, that on getting out of the chapel, such was the treatment she received there, that she was obliged to lean against the outward wall

before she could recover sufficient strength to proceed home. And saith that she has not since recovered the effects of the treatment she received. Deponent positively saith she does not make this affidavit from any vindictive feeling, but with a view to substantiate the statement already made by her to the Rev. Dawson Massy, and as an act of justice to him.

"Sworn before me, this 15th day of April, 1839.

"G. H. FITZGERALD,
"*Mayor of Limerick.*"

That this affidavit should not go before the world recommended only by its own intrinsic merits; and that the reverend promoter and procurer of it should appear under all the impress which a character for fervent zeal, and devotion, and sanctity never fails to produce, the *Limerick Chronicle* accompanied his epistle and her affidavit with the following praises:

"The reader will find in our columns this day, a letter from the Rev. Dawson Massy, relative to an outrage upon a Protestant lady in a Roman Catholic chapel, during Passion week. Annexed to this letter is the affidavit of that lady, one of his parishioners, describing the unmanly outrage which she had, in the first instance, communicated to her pastor, and which he felt it his duty to proclaim from the narrative of his parishioner. The exposure did create a feeling of amazement and indignation in the public mind, which was not abated by the mistake a Protestant would naturally incur by naming one chapel for another, not being, of course, *au fait* to their various denominations, and probably never having been within their precincts before. The fact, however, of the assault, was too impressive, and that now rests upon the relative credit of a lady, who has been obliged to corroborate her statement by an oath, in reply to the denial of the Rev. Mr. Raleigh, curate of St. Michael's chapel, whose letter appeared in our last. The Rev. D. Massy asserts the high respectability of this young lady, and we ask, is there a Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Dissenter, in the city of Limerick, acquainted with the character of that clergyman, to believe, for an instant, that he would adopt a groundless charge of crimination against any human being? His holy ministry, his well-known innate piety, and his boundless love of gospel truth, afford a triumphant refutation of the vile absurdity. A fervent zeal and devotion which never tires, a spirit of charity pure and disinterested as ever warmed the breast of a Christian pastor, are the characteristics of the Rev. Dawson Massy, while on his Master's mission for the last five years in St. Michael's parish, where his labours, too, thanks to the Divine blessing,

have been attended with abundant fruits. Did such a clergyman merit the coarse and reproachful language applied by the Rev. Mr. Raleigh, because he had vindicated the cause of the oppressed and defenceless? Abuse is not proof against argument—*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis, tempus eget.* The Rev. Mr· Raleigh must take new ground, if he can expect 'to rail the seal off the bond' which is now in legitimate form before the public. The Rev. Mr. Massy, conscious of having done his duty, may rely with confidence upon the good opinion and support of all worthy men."

The Rev. Mr. Raleigh, on the day subsequent to the appearance of the preceding documents, addressed a short letter to the editor of the *Chronicle*, upon whom a new light appears to be breaking. In introducing it he says—

"The friends of truth will be happy to see this extraordinary affair, which has now assumed a new colouring, satisfactorily and clearly elucidated before a proper tribunal, where all parties must have a clear hearing."

"Sexton Street, April 17.

"*To the Editor of the Limerick Chronicle,*

"*Sir*:—You and every unprejudiced person, must easily perceive, that the meek epistle of the Rev. Dawson Massy, the nameless affidavit, so far short of the former statement, and so contradictory to itself, and the well-tempered and gentlemanlike article of the *Standard*, leave the charge against me as unsupported and as fictitious as ever.

"I am sustained by eye-witnesses, and furnished with authentic documents, which will prove before the proper tribunal, the whole transaction to be what I have already designated it, 'a gross falsehood, and a malicious fabrication.'

"I remain, sir, with great respect, your obliged, and obedient servant.

"James Raleigh, *V. P. St. Michael's.*"

This is the last publication connected with this "extraordinary affair," which we have been able to trace—and we believe there was no other—until we find it before the "proper tribunal," where, as the *Limerick Chronicle* said, "all parties must have a hearing." But no—there was no hearing, and the Rev. Mr. Dawson Massy was prevented, by a compromise, which it is deeply to be regretted should ever have taken place, no matter by whom recommended or sanctioned, from establishing the case got up against the Catholic clergy by "his well-known innate piety—his boundless love of gospel truth—his fervent zeal and

devotion which never tire—and his spirit of charity, pure and disinterested as ever warmed the heart of a Christian pastor!" Great attributes are these, and we can only condole with those who invested him with them, that instead of exhibiting them to the admiration of the expected auditory who assembled from all places to listen to his praises—to behold that "young unprotected Protestant, his parishioner," and to hear her narrate the affecting story detailed to her affidavit, he appeared as a repentant defamer of the priest's character, averting by his written act of contrition, the consequences which must have followed if the case had been gone into. "Deep regret he expresses certainly at having," now that he has more fully investigated the matter, countenanced any publication which threw any imputation on the character or conduct of the reverend gentleman whom he had so grossly libelled; to which he adds an apology, and a consent that a verdict shall be entered against him for costs. Here is the letter of apology and the consent read in open court:

"*Raleigh vs. Massy*

"*Sir*:—In reference to the subject matter of this action brought by you against me, having now more fully investigated the subject, I beg leave to express my deep regret at having interfered in countenancing any publication which threw any imputation on your character or conduct, and to express my further regret, that the imputation on your character should have been occasioned by any proceeding on my part—and understanding that you do not attribute my conduct to any malicious or unworthy motive, I offer you this apology, and consent that a verdict shall be entered for you with costs, to be taxed between party and party.

"For the Rev. Dawson Massy,

"JAMES M'MAHON, *his Attorney.*

"CORK, July 29th, 1839."

And annexed is the apology of the proprietor of the *Standard*, in which Mr. Dawson Massy published his matter, and which accompanied it with observations quite as outrageous and libellous:

"*Raleigh vs. Dartnell*

"*To Rev. James Raleigh,*

"*Sir*:—With reference to the subject matter of the action, brought against me, I beg leave to express my regret at the publication of the charges and imputations which appeared in my paper relative to your

conduct and character. I have no hesitation in retracting all offensive expressions towards you, which were inserted in my newspaper, and I offer you this apology, and consent that a verdict be entered for you, with costs, to be taxed between party and party.

"EDWARD TAYLOR DARTNELL."

Here is the case which has been withdrawn from public inquiry by an injudicious settlement. It is compiled from every document to which we could get access, and we challenge any complaint impeaching its fidelity and accuracy. When we found that the case was settled, and recollected that the original libel, and all the letters persisting in it up to the last moment, were published in the English and Irish Tory papers, and came back to us commented upon in a spirit kindred to that which gave birth to the outrageous fabrication, we deemed it our duty to try back and to lay the circumstances in a connected shape before the public, satisfied that the plain tale alone is sufficient to expose, in all its hideous deformity, that system—of which this case is only one ramification—of malignant slander and calumny directed against the Catholic clergy. What ingredient that is necessary to make up the greatest amount of baseness that could be congregated in any one bad act is there not to be found in this proceeding, from the fraud and falsehood in which it originated down to the swearing with which it was sought to be propped up by the "young unprotected Protestant," the Reverend Mr. Massy's parishioner, And yet this is but one of countless fabrications, of a similar nature, and having the same object in view, which the tory journals are every day outpouring—not tangible, as this has been made by circumstances, but as palpably false on the face of them, though the cowardly slanderers who invent or issue them will afford no clue by which they can be exposed. It was our intention to have adverted to, and published, several of these infamous falschoods, as they appeared under the headings given above, in the journals which at once degraded themselves and outrage truth and decency by publishing them, and we proposed to show, from various combining circumstances, that they were got up in concert, and were a part of an arranged system which had for its object—so far as such unmanly instruments could effect it—to blight and blast the character of the Catholic clergy as a body. But we must defer doing so until our next number, and we shall then have to draw largely upon the *Constitution* files for as gross and infamous falsehoods as even those of its Limerick colleagues and associates supply. When we have disposed of them, we will again ask the question—should not means be resorted to, to protect the Catholic clergy from these malignant attacks?

BEAUFORT, S. C., Sept. 17, 1839.

To the Editors of the Courier,

Gentlemen:—Please give the underwritten reply to Bishop England a place in your paper. I am glad that you have adopted the rule which you published. I think it very reasonable; and however expensive, it relieves me from the pain I before felt in trespassing upon your courtesy.

I have the honour to remain,

Your most obedient servant,

RICHARD FULLER.

To the Right Reverend Bishop England,

Reverend Sir:—I protest against the use you make of a mere pleasantry of mine as to "saving you from insolvency;" and every candid reader will unite with me in this protest. You yourself must have felt that I alluded not to your poverty, but your prolixity. Was it, then, generous, or fair, to supply your lack of argument by this appeal to the evil passions of your readers? Judging from your note to the editors, offering to "pay their bill on presentation," I conclude that your exchequer is in a much better state than my own; which, truth to say, utterly forbids me making any such offer, and earnestly deprecates any such "presentation" just now.

The only part of your letter requiring notice is that which refers to the canon of the Lateran Council; and I assure you, sir, that I have examined your remarks, and read over and over the passage you adduce, in the hope of finding some satisfactory explanation. The subject is one of most grave and solemn importance to the community, inasmuch as you assured me in your very first note that "your religion you hold now as to doctrine, as it was held at all times;" and, indeed, the catechism, now issued by you in Charleston, contains the following questions and answers for the Catechumen:

Q. "From whom are we to learn the doctrines of Christ?"

A. "From the bishops who have succeeded to the Apostles, as the first Christians learned them from the Apostles."

Q. "Cannot these bishops teach us erroneous doctrines instead of truth?"

A. "No; we will infallibly receive the doctrine of Christ from the great body of bishops, with the Pope at their head."

As you claim, therefore, infallibility, and affirm that the doctrines of your church are now what they always were, (and, of course, would be enforced if you possessed the power,) it is the imperious duty of every

citizen to inform himself what these doctrines were. At present I restrict my inquiry to the Lateran decision.

As to this you charge Faber with "dishonest garbling;" but to my mind his argument appears conclusive, and your accusation entirely unfounded. I really hope that the community will read Faber's work. For research and impartiality, he had scarcely any superior in England; and your letters, now before me, furnish one strong confirmation of my remark that "his character defies any assault." [38]

What is the charge of Faber? It is this. The Lateran Council lays down the broad principle that an oath, however solemnly taken, must be violated when such violation is required by the interests of the church, or the enactments of the fathers. How does he show this? By giving the words of the Council, "for oaths are not to be esteemed oaths, but rather perjury, when they oppose ecclesiastical utility, and the enactments of the holy fathers." Now let it be remembered; 1. That as to this "ecclesiastical utility," the church itself is the sole judge. 2. That if there be no enactments of the holy fathers, the church can at once pass them. 3. That oaths against ecclesiastical utility and such enactments, are pronounced, not only not binding, but "perjury," and, therefore, their violation is a duty to God. Let these things be borne in mind, and I ask, is not Faber's assertion fully substantiated? And is not my affirmation incontestable, that "the third Lateran Council, makes not only falsehood, but perjury, a virtue in behalf of the church?" Nor do I perceive anything in your remarks to rebut these conclusions. What are your arguments? I will state their substance as I understand them—requesting our readers to refer to your letters, and correct me, if I do not place them in the strongest light.

First, you draw an idle distinction, and deny that the council authorizes falsehood, even if it does perjury. But are you serious? Perjury is a falsehood in its most aggravated form; and if the Lateran decree justifies this, and makes this a duty, much more does it justify falsehood in its simplest and lowest degree. This is exactly what I said, "not only falsehood (i. e. simple untruth), but perjury," and so forth.

But you deny that the council makes perjury a duty; and you enter upon a course of argument, which, I confess, amazes me, and to which I entreat the serious attention of the public.

1. You ask me this general question—"Would an oath taken by a citizen of our state against the public welfare be considered obligatory?

[38] It is probably well known to most of our readers, that a nephew of G. S. Faber, the Rev. F. W. Faber, is now a Catholic priest in England.

Would the court which should decide that the citizen who took it, and continued to adhere to it, was not bound by that oath, upon the ground that it was not an oath, but perjury, be justly accused of teaching that perjury was lawful?'' Here is a general question put, and I have read it again and again, and submitted it to two gentlemen of the bar, as I could scarcely believe my own eyes. What! if South Carolina and Georgia were engaged in a suit before the United States Court, and I were a witness, sworn to speak the whole truth, and my testimony would decide the cause against the state, do you ask whether I would be bound to reveal the truth? Sir, you tell me what is ''perjury among Catholics;'' but I tell you that if in such a case, a witness should wilfully suppress anything, Protestants would punish and brand him as a perjurer; and a Protestant judge and jury would regard his knavery as only surpassed by his folly, were he to plead ''that an oath taken by a citizen of our state against its public welfare is not obligatory.''

2. You refer me to the 21st chapter of Paley, which is nothing at all to the purpose. You put the case of the American Revolution, viz.: a nation throwing off the yoke of oppression, which is nothing at all to the purpose. You cite the instance of the Protestant princes, who required the Catholics at the Council of Trent to be governed ''only by the holy Scriptures,'' and not by oaths which were directly against those Scriptures, which is nothing at all to the purpose. Sir, have compassion for my purse, if you have none for your own.

3. You allege, and with an air of apparent confidence which is surprising, that the context proves Faber to be guilty of ''dishonest garbling.'' As well might I bring this accusation against you, for giving still only an extract of the decree. Faber quoted all that was necessary, viz.: the general rule recognised by the whole church. The context cited by you, shows that the Lateran Council did not enact this rule, but that it was an established principle, which they adduced to regulate a particular case. The particular case was this. A majority of the church is supposed to pass an ordinance, (as this very Lateran Council imposed upon Catholics the obligation of destroying, as heretics, all who would not join the church, I will take this as an example.) The minority is supposed to resist this ordinance, on the ground that their oaths prevent their obedience, (pursuing my hypothesis, I make them urge against burning heretics, not only the law of God forbidding murder, but their oaths.) How does the council settle this particular case? Does it simply say, that in church discipline the majority must govern? By no means. It requires the minority to co-operate in all cases, ''because'' (here is the general principle,) ''oaths are not to be

esteemed oaths, but rather perjury, when they conflict with the utility of the church, or the enactments of the fathers''—that is to say, such oaths are not merely of no force, but ''perjury,'' and, therefore, it is a virtue to violate them. Now, at that time your church began to depose monarchs; and the most common oaths which stood in its way, were those of allegiance. It was, too, a vast body whose decisions were not merely ecclesiastical regulations for discipline, but laws for the whole of Europe; and I ask, can anything be plainer than that this canon requires the violation of every oath, whenever ''the interests of the church'' should demand it?

4. Nor, sir, do you reprobate this shocking principle, if I understand you, but defend it. You say, your church ''was then the aggregate of the civilized world, and believed by the bulk of Christendom to be the church established by Christ to lead man to salvation,'' and you maintain that ''oaths'' (all oaths no matter how awful) ''against the utility of this body were not oaths, but perjuries.'' I appeal to your last letter, where this monstrous proposition—the very one charged upon the council in 1179 by Faber, is by you vindicated in 1839! And that I am not mistaken is plain, since you argue the point, and give your reasons. With all its ambiguity, your argument if I err not, stands thus:—1st. Every citizen is bound by the constitution. 2d. But this obligation to this constitution, and to his oaths under it, is inferior to the obligation he owes to the divine law. 3d. The Roman Catholic Church is in the place of God, it is ''the Church established by Christ, to lead man to salvation,'' and its ''utility and enactments,'' are of the same force as the divine law. 4th. Therefore any oath taken by a citizen under the constitution of his state is not only not binding, but is perjury, and to be unscrupulously violated, if the interests and enactments of the Church require such violation!!

Reverend sir, I look at this argument with undissembled grief and alarm. I am unwilling to believe that you will continue to uphold it, whatever the Lateran Council taught. I regret that, at the commencement of this letter, a single word escaped me, which breathed not the deepest solemnity. My duty to God and my country bids me be serious now, if ever I was serious in my life. If ''these are the principles which you have been taught by Roman Catholic authors and by Roman Catholic professors,''—if ''these are the principles which you find recognised in all the enactments and interpretations of Roman Catholic councils,'' what must a Protestant community say? How inadequate has been our gratitude to Almighty God for a reformation, which has put once more into our hands the Bible, the lamp ordained ''by Christ,

to lead man to salvation," and emancipated our conscience from a tyranny—whose only rule is its own arbitrary enactments, and which, to "utility" sacrifices not only the constitution of states, but the awful sanctions of the most sacred appeals to heaven.

Sir, believe me, when I tell you, that I say these things in sorrow. God is my witness that my tears are on the paper while I write. Forgive me, sir, you must forgive me; but when I think of the souls whose everlasting destinies depend on you, I am unable to repress my feelings. Death has been busy in your fair city. Afflicted Charleston! one hundred years ago Whitfield said that her motto was "chastened, yet not corrected." Already two watchmen have been called to the irreversible retributions of eternity; and to-morrow, perhaps, you and I may stand at the foot of the august tribunal. In view of that judgment seat, and as you would face the Judge in peace, I implore you, reverend sir, cease from doctrines which the word of God condemns: abandon a claim to infallibility, which will involve you for ever in attempts to defend error, and which Jehovah frowns upon as an impious usurpation: leave the councils, and the Roman Catholic authors, which have been, you say, your teachers, and take for yourself, and give to your flock, that book—which alone can guide man with unerring wisdom—and which, while it denounces as blasphemy all human pretentions to forgive sins, leads us to the fountain open for sin, and lifts on high that cross before whose majesty pursuing justice stops in reverence cowering, and under whose shelter the guiltiest thing finds pardon and peace here, and immortal glory beyond the tomb.

I have finished this just in time for the mail. Should I keep it a day, I might, perhaps, expunge these closing remarks. But I send them. Slighted by you, they will be, but, at least, you cannot misinterpret nor be displeased with my motives, however you may esteem them a weakness—and I know that in a dying hour, I shall feel no regret for having penned these lines.

Some observations I had designed on the singular way you have, when I adduce the most distinguished historians—even Catholics like De Thou—of replying that somebody (not informing me who) abused them for telling the truth. But I have neither time nor a heart to descend to such subjects now. The *Tax-book*, clearly as I have proved it, appears to me a trifle, when compared with this Lateran decree, which you openly justify.

And now, sir, as this is, I hope, my last communication let me beg that we may part at least not in anger. If, in any of my papers, I have uttered a single expression wounding to your feelings, forgive

it. We are strangers; and will probably continue so until that day, when the great white throne shall be piled for judgment, and the secrets of all hearts be revealed. For that day, may we both be prepared, and in anticipation of its tremendous details, may we both walk humbly in the fear of God, and live in peace with each other, and with all the world!

I have the honour to remain,

Reverend sir,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

RICHARD FULLER.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 23, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT,

Reverend Sir:—I beg leave, in reply to your letter in the *Courier* of this morning to say:

1st. I had not as clear a perception as you assume that I had, respecting your allusion to "saving me from insolvency." Your statement respecting your meaning is to me, in this case, evidence, and I make you every concession you desire.

2d. You insist that the third Council of Lateran taught that falsehood and perjury were virtues, when committed for the good of the church.

To fasten upon me and upon all Catholics the doctrine of that Council, you have recourse to the *Catechism* of this diocess and to our tenet of the infallibility of the church. I grant you upon this subject all that I can, viz.: I am bound by everything that council taught regarding faith and morals. I believe that what it taught regarding oaths is the doctrine of God.

Your effort is to save from the charge of dishonest garbling, G. S. Faber, who took out of the body of a canon one of many propositions which it contains, so stript of its context, to establish this charge. I leave to those who read the canon to say whether you have succeeded.

I was taught that *transitus a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter*, was a sophism. That is, that the reasoning was not good which drew a universal conclusion from particular premises. The council was legislating for a particular case; the maxim referred to that class which contained this case, viz.: what Paley designates under the head of oaths to observe local statutes; and Mr. Faber's logic and yours is to draw from these particular premises a universal conclusion, embrac-

ing all classes of oaths. I am greatly mistaken in my estimate of the mind of South Carolina, if it will not detect and appreciate as it ought this effort.

The chapters were ecclesiastical bodies; their local and particular regulations were not to be in opposition to the utility of the church, nor in opposition to the enactments of the fathers, that is, of the general legislative body, but were to be subservient to the first, and in accordance with the second. The original principle was that their capitular acts should be those of the more numerous and the elder portions of the body. This was in keeping with the "utility of the church and the enactments of the fathers." Abuses are introduced, by which the acts of these bodies are in some places obstructed by the factious, and self-willed, and unreasonable opposition of the minority and the juniors. They allege that this is a custom which they have sworn to observe: the supreme ecclesiastical legislature enacts that the abuse should be abolished, and declares that the oath of ecclesiastics to observe a pernicious abuse, to the injury of that church, to sustain which that chapter was created, was not an oath, but a perjury, because it was against the object of their institution, and against the enactments of the supreme legislative body of the society. Now this principle applies here to the particular case, and it does not assert that an oath taken by a citizen to fulfil his duties as a sheriff, as a judge, as a soldier, is to be regulated by the enactments of the fathers, but by the parity of reasoning that such oaths are to be regulated by the legislatures which create and control these officers respectively.

Again you extend the principle to oaths regarding testimony. This is a different class of oaths, and the sophistry is if possible worse, because the maxim in no way has relation to such oaths. In this case it is what the old school men call *transitus a genere ad genus*, or shifting the question and changing the terms.

In noticing the distinction between falsehood and perjury, I only followed you. Faber said nothing of falsehood; he was content with perjury, but you added falsehood.

My general question, as you call it, regarded not oaths in testimony, as was evident from the whole context, but oaths to observe local statutes or customs. The case which you put is a case of testimony, and has no relation whatever to the case on which I put the question. How did you overlook what I wrote regarding oaths on testimony when I was on that subject?

"If we swear to declare the truth, and do not declare it, it would be perjury: and should a man attempt to bind me by the form of an

oath to declare a falsehood, I would be guilty of perjury in going through the form which I profaned; but not only am I not compelled by this form to tell a lie, but I am obliged to go against the words by which I appeared to be bound, because it is no oath, but a perjury."

Thus, sir, in your case between Georgia and South Carolina, the witness who, being sworn, would not testify "truth—the whole truth—and nothing but the truth"—would testify an untruth, and would conceal the truth, or would equivocate or misrepresent—would be guilty of perjury, because he would not have sworn *in truth*; and if he concealed what it would be conducive to justice to make known, or falsely suggested what was calculated to produce injustice, he would be guilty of perjury, for his oath would not be *in justice*; and he could not be excused by his own state for his perjury, upon the ground that it was done for her welfare, because, even if justice and perjury tended to her utility, evil is not to be done that good may arise therefrom; and there can be no greater evil than unjust falsehood, under cover of the semblance of an oath. Neither the utility of the church nor the utility of the state will justify or palliate it.

You have read the 13th chapter of our *Catechism*. I suppose you had the curiosity to read the 19th also. If so, how did you avoid noticing the following questions and answers?

Q. What else is commanded by the second commandment?

A. To keep our lawful oaths and vows.

Q. What is forbidden by this commandment?

A. All false, rash, unjust, and unnecessary oaths; also cursing, swearing, blaspheming, and profane words. (*Matt.* v. 34; *St. James* v. 12.)

Q. Is it ever lawful to swear?

A. It is: when God's honour, our own, or our neighbour's good, or necessary defence requires it.

Q. What do you mean by an unjust oath?

A. An oath injurious to God, to ourselves, or to our neighbour.

Q. Is a person obliged to keep an unjust oath?

A. No: he sinned in taking it, and would sin also in keeping it.

Q. Is a person obliged to keep a lawful oath?

A. Yes; and it would be perjury to break it.

Q. What is perjury?

A. The breaking of a lawful oath, or the taking or an unlawful one.

Q. Is perjury a great crime?

A. It is a most grievous one.

Now I shall suppose you read the 20th chapter. How did you overlook the following?

Q. What is forbidden by the eighth commandment?

A. All false testimony, rash judgment, and lies.

Q. Is is lawful to tell an innocent or jocose lie, or to tell a lie for a good purpose?

A. No lie can be lawful or innocent, and no motive, however good, can excuse a lie, because a lie is always sinful and bad in itself. (*John* viii. 44.)

Q. What else is forbidden by the eighth commandment?

A. Backbiting, calumny, and detraction, and all words and speeches hurtful to our neighbour's honour or reputation.

Q. What is commanded by the eighth commandment?

A. To speak of others with justice and charity, as we would be glad they would speak of us, and to witness the truth in all things.

Now, after having read the above, I am confident you will regard the following question and answer, which conclude the chapter, as fully exhibiting the spirit of that Bible whose maxims you so earnestly commend to my attention.

Q. What must they do, who have given false evidence against a neighbour, or who have spoken ill of him, or injured his character in any respect?

A. They must repair the injury done him as far as they are able, and make him satisfaction by restoring his good name as soon as possible, otherwise the sin will never be forgiven them.

In the 21st are the following questions and answers, which are in keeping with those quoted above:

Q. How am I to love my neighbour as myself?

A. As you would, says Christ, that men should do unto you, do you also unto them in like manner. (*Luke* vi. 31.)

Q. What particular duties are required of me by that rule?

A. Never to injure your neighbour by word or deed in his person, property, or character: to wish well to him, as far as you are able, in his spiritual and corporal necessities.

Q. Am I obliged to love my enemies?

A. Most certainly. Love your enemies, says Christ, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you. (*Luke* vi; *Matt.* v.)

I shall conclude this catechetical instruction, which exhibits our relative duties, with two questions and answers, which conclude the 17th chapter.

Q. Who is my neighbour?

A. Every human being.

Q. Am I to consider those persons who are opposed to the true religion as my neighbours?

A. Yes, undoubtedly: to punish for voluntary error is the prerogative of God; to show mercy and kindness to his fellow-mortals is the duty of man. (*Luke* x. 37.)

Now, sir, I leave to yourself and the "two gentlemen of the bar" to decide in which category you will place the attempt to confound the two classes of oaths which every jurist distinguishes, and to apply a maxim which regards an oath to observe local statutes, to an oath to give true testimony. I shall not call it "knavery," or "folly," or fraud. I shall leave to our readers to form their own opinion.

Your opinion of the applicability of Paley's reasoning is not mine. It is for our readers to judge which is correct. The case of the patriots of the Revolution I consider quite in point. The Protestant princes, I shall suppose, considered the principles of the Roman Catholic Church to be abuses substituted for the original, pure institutions of the Saviour. The council considered the bad customs of a minority of some of the chapters to be abuses substituted for the original sound institutions by which they were established. The bishops were sworn to observe the principles of the church; the members of the chapters were sworn to observe the customs of their churches. The Protestant princes said that an oath to sustain an abuse against the pure, original institution should not be obligatory on the bishops. The council said that an oath to sustain an abuse against the original, sound institution was perjury, and no oath. I apprehend there never was a more perfect parallel.

Your paragraph marked 3, is, in my view, one of the most unfortunate that has escaped from your pen.

Faber quotes a couple of lines out of a canon which contains about twenty; by separating the proposition which his extract contains from the context which surrounds it, he takes a dishonest occasion of extending its application beyond its meaning in the canon, without giving the deceived reader an opportunity of detecting his imposture. I quote every word of the canon, and you tell me that I am equally guilty of dishonest garbling as he was. I thank you, sir, for your courtesy; and I appeal to our readers from your injustice!

You say that what he quoted was the general rule recognised as law by the whole church. It was, sir, but only for that class of cases to which it is applicable. That class, sir, was the particular one, of oaths to observe local statutes, or customs of particular churches. It ex-

tended generally to each individual case of this class, but not beyond that class itself; and the dishonesty consisted in representing it to extend to other classes, for instance, to oaths of witnesses. I shall, in another place, notice more fully your exemplification of "destroying heretics." For the present I tell you that this council made no "ordinance obliging Catholics to destroy as heretics all who would not join the church." The argument you found on this supposition, is, therefore, baseless; for, first, the fact is not as you state or suppose—and next, if the fact were as you suppose, the maxim would not apply to such a case.

Your next effort in this same paragraph is to extend the application of the maxims to oaths of allegiance. They are a different class altogether. They are based upon a contract between him to whom the oath is taken and those who take it. The King of England, by his misgovernment of the old thirteen colonies, violated his duty; and thereby his subjects in these colonies were absolved from the obligation of their oaths. Other cases have arisen, in which, upon just principles, subjects were also thus absolved. I shall, in its proper place, show that, in your allusion to this, you are by no means sustaining your conclusion.

In your paragraph marked 4, you exhibit me unfairly. You charge me with sustaining the "shocking principle," that the maxim of law which refers to oaths to observe local statutes, extends to every oath. Sir, I sustain no such principle. You exhibit me as making the Roman Catholic Church, in 1179, claim a power to destroy the first principles of morality; and for this purpose you put into my mouth a semblance of reasoning which I never used.

My argument, sir, would have been more fairly put in this way. Man's first duty is to observe the divine law; but the divine law requires that an oath shall bind when it is taken in truth, in judgment, and in justice,—and that it shall not bind when either of these conditions is wanted. The divine law is paramount to every other law, constitution, tribunal or authority. Therefore no law, constitution, tribunal or authority, can allow a man to swear falsely, to swear in support of injustice, or to swear rashly, or injudiciously, or profanely. No tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical, can do what God himself could not do! he cannot do what is incompatible with his divine attributes; the sanctioning of perjury would be incompatible therewith, and therefore no tribunal could sanction it. This was my reasoning, and I cannot feel you treat me justly in your effort to distort it. Badly and ambiguously as I write, I do not wish for such a commentator as you are.

I leave your effort and my explanation in the hands of our readers. I never said that the enactments of the church were of the same force as the divine law. I never said that the utility of the church was of the same force as the divine law; and therefore you have untruly attributed to me the contents of your 3d specification, which you call my argument. The value of the conclusion which you draw under the 4th specification depends upon the truth of the contents of the 3d. Its contents are untrue.

Sir, Europe and America, I may add Asia and Africa, indeed I may say, heaven and earth, have, during upwards of two centuries, witnessed the practical refutation of the cruel libel which you copy from Mr. Faber. It is written, sir, by the hand of desolation in characters of plunder, of blood, of confiscation, of tyranny and ruin, to which paganism affords no parallel; and in the midst of the appalling exhibition, Protestantism proclaims to the universe that the strongest bond upon a Catholic is the respect in which he holds the sanctity of an oath!

When the genius of Protestant ascendancy sought the ruin of Catholics in England, in Ireland, in Scotland, and in the British colonies, its most formidable weapon was an oath! They who took it were to receive the dignities of the state, the wealth of the land, the honours of the world. They who refused it, saw themselves doomed to the loss of their goods, the confiscation of their estates, the degradation of infamy, the exclusion from power and from place, to prison, to banishment, and to death. What you would call the utility of their church, would be promoted by their perjury; at intervals their pitying friends proposed ambiguous modifications to be substituted for the words to which they objected. Their church proclaimed the unchanged truth; it is criminal to palter with ambiguity. You must swear according to the ascertained and published intention of him who proposes the oath. They respect the oath, and they and their descendants in successive millions through succeeding generations, have been the victims to their veneration for an oath! The Protestant rulers knew their principles, and they profited by the knowledge; they were enriched by their property; they were stained by their blood, and in the worst spirit of criminality, they added calumny to cruelty, and proclaimed to the astonished world, that their victims, who had sacrificed everything to their respect for an oath, could be bound by no oath, when there was question of the utility of their church!! Mr. Faber has garbled dishonestly a canon to sustain the calumny, and Mr. Fuller distorts my statements to protect him!

As you kindly shoot a couple of arrows at me upon your departure, I cannot but make my acknowledgments.

You talk of destroying heretics, and of deposing monarchs. They are thread-bare themes in Europe; but every day convinces me that we shall still unfortunately have to go over the ground for years in America. Be it so!

Nearly fourteen years have elapsed since I had the honour of addressing our Congress upon these, as well as other topics. At the request of some of the members, I wrote and published the substance of what I said on that occasion. I shall beg leave again to use my own words. I apprehend that you attributed to the third Council of Lateran held in 1179, the canon of the fourth, held in 1215. Speaking of it, I said:

"We now come to examine what are called the persecuting laws of our church. In the year 1215, at the Council of Lateran, certain heresies were condemned by the first canon; and amongst other things, this canon recites as Catholic faith, in opposition to the errors of those whom it condemned: that there was but one God, the creator of all things, of spirits as well as bodies; the author of the Old Testament and of the Mosaic dispensation, equally as of the New Testament and of the Christian dispensation; that he created not only the good angels, but also the devil and the bad angels, originally coming good from his hand, and becoming wicked by their own malice, and so forth. In its third canon it excommunicates those heretics, and declares them to be separated from the body of the church. Then follows a direction, that the heretics so condemned are to be given up to the secular powers, or to the baliff, to be duly punished. This direction continues to require of all bishops, and others having authority, to make due search within their several districts for those heretics; and if they will not be induced to retract their errors, desires that they should be delivered over to be punished. There is an injunction, then, to all temporal lords to cleanse their dominions, by exterminating those heretics; and if they will not, within a year from having been so admonished by the church, cleanse their lands of this heretical filth, they shall be deprived if they have superior lords; and if they be superior lords and be negligent, it shall be the duty of the metropolitan and his provincial bishops to excommunicate them; and if any one of those lords paramount so excommunicated for this negligence, shall continue during twelve months under the excommunication, the metropolitan shall certify the same to the Pope, who, finding admonition useless, shall depose this prince, and absolve his subjects from their oaths of fealty, and deliver

the territory over to Catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, shall remain in peaceable possession.

"This is the most formidable evidence adduced against the position which I have laid down, that it is not a doctrine of our church, that we are bound to persecute those who differ from us in belief. I trust that I shall not occupy very much of your time in showing that this enactment does not in any way weaken that assertion. I shall do so, by satisfying you that this is a special law for a particular case; and also by convincing you that it is not a canon of the church respecting any of those points in which we admit her infallibility; nor is this order a canon of the church.

"The doctrines condemned in the first canon originated in Syria, touched lightly at the islands of the Archipelago, settled down in Bulgaria, and spread into the south of Europe, but were principally received in the vicinity of Albi, in France. The person condemned held the Manichean principle of there being two creators of the universe; one a good being, the author of the New Testament, the creator of good angels, and generally of spiritual essence; the other evil being, the creator of bodies, the author of the Mosaic dispensation, and generally of the Old Testament. They stated that marriage was unlawful, and co-operation with the principle of evil was criminal. The consequences to society were of the very worst description, immoral, dismal, and desolating. The church examined the doctrine, condemned it as heretical, and cut off those who held or abetted it, from her communion. Here, according to the principles which I have maintained before you, her power ended. Beyond this we claim no authority; the church, by divine right, we say, infallibly testifies what doctrine Christ has revealed, and by the same right, in the same manner decides that what contradicts this revelation is erroneous; but she has no divine authority to make a law which shall strip of their property, or consign to the executioner those whom she convicts of error. The doctrine of our obligation to submit does not extend to force us to submit to an usurpation; and if the church made a law upon a subject beyond her commission for legislation, it would be invalid; there would be no proper claim for our obedience: usurpation does not create a right. The council could by right make the doctrinal decision, but it had no right to make the temporal enactment; and where there exists no right to legislate on one side, there is no obligation of obedience on the other. If this was then a canon of the church, it was not one in making which she was acting within her constitutional jurisdiction, it was an usurpa-

tion of temporal government, and the doctrine of infallibility does not bear upon it.

"Every document respecting this council, the entire of the evidence regarding it, as well as the mode of framing the enactments, proves that it was a special law regarding a particular case. The only persons whose errors were condemned at that council, were those whom I have described. The general principle of legal exposition, restraining the application of penal enactments, must here have full weight, and will restrain the application of the penalty to the only criminals brought within its view. But the evidence is still more confirmed by the special words of definite meaning, *this,* and *filth,* which were specially descriptive of only those persons; the first by its very nature, the second by the nature of their crime; and the continued exposition of the enactment restrained its application to the special case, though frequently attempts have been made by individuals to extend its application, not in virtue of the statute, but in the virtue of analogy. It would then be improperly forcing its construction, to say that its operation was to be general, as it evidently was made only for a particular case.

"In viewing the preamble to this council, as well as from our knowledge of history, we discover that this was not merely a council of the church, but it was also a congress of the civilized world. The state of the times rendered such assemblages not only usual, but necessary, and each legislative body did its own business by its own authority; and very generally the subjects which were decided upon by one body, in one point of view, came under the consideration of the other assembly in a different point of view, and their separate decisions were often engrossed upon a joint record. Sometimes they were preserved distinct and separate, but copyists, for their own convenience, brought together all the articles regarding the same subject, from what source soever they were obtained. Such was precisely the case in the instance before us. There were present on this occasion, by themselves or by their legates, the King of Sicily, Emperor-elect of the Romans, the Emperor of the East, the King of France, the King of England, the King of Arragon, the King of Jerusalem, the King of Cyprus, several other kings and lords paramount, sovereign states, and princes. Several of the bishops were princes or barons. In the ecclesiastical council, the third canon terminated exactly in one sentence, which was that of the excommunication or separation from the church, of those whom the first canon had condemned, whatever name or names they might assume; because they had in several places several appellations, and were

continually dividing off and changing names as they separated. The duty of the jurisdiction of the council came to this; and the ancient records give no more as the portion of its enactments. But the congress of the temporal powers then made the subsequent part of their enactment: and thus this penal and civil regulation was not an act of the council, but an act of the congress; and it is not a canon concerning the doctrine of the church, nor indeed is it by any means a canon, though the copyists have added it to the canon, as regarding the very same subject; and as confessedly the excommunication in the third canon regarded only the special case of those particular heretics, the addition of the penal enactment to this particular canon, is confirmatory evidence that those who added to it knew that the penalty, in the one case, was only co-extensive with the excommunication in the other.

"Having thus seen that this canon of the Council of Lateran was not a doctrinal decision of our church, establishing the doctrine of persecution, and commanding to persecute, but that it was a civil enactment by the temporal power against persons whom they looked upon as criminals, it is more the province of the politician or of the jurist, than of the divine, to decide upon its propriety. I may, however, be permitted to say, that, in my opinion, the existence of civilized society required its enactment, though no good man can approve of several abuses which were committed under the pretext of its execution, nor can any rational man pretend, that because of the existence of a special law for a particular purpose, every case which may be thought analogous to that for which provision was made, is to be illegally subjected to those provisions.

"We are now arrived at the place where we may easily find the origin and the extent of the papal power of deposing sovereigns, and of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance. To judge properly of facts, we must know their special circumstances, not their mere outline. The circumstances of Christendom were then widely different from those in which we now are placed. Europe was then under the feudal system. I have seldom found a writer, not a Catholic, who, in treating of that age and that system, has been accurate, and who has not done us very serious injustice. But a friend [39] of mine, who is a respectable member of your honourable body, has led me to read Hallam's account of it, and I must say that I have seldom in such a book met with so much candour, and, what I call, so much truth. From reading his statement of that system it will be plainly seen that there existed

[39] Col. William Drayton.

amongst the Christian potentates a sort of federation in which they bound themselves by certain regulations, and to the observance of those they were held not merely by their oaths, but by various penalties, sometimes they consented the penalty should be the loss of their station. It was of course necessary to ascertain that the fact existed before its consequences should be declared to follow; is was also necessary to establish some tribunal to examine and to decide as to the existence of the fact itself, and to proclaim that existence. Amongst independent sovereigns there was no superior, and it was natural to fear that mutual jealousy would create great difficulty in selecting a chief: and that what originated in concession might afterwards be claimed as a right. They were, however, all members of one church, of which the Pope was the head, and, in this respect, their common father; and by universal consent it was regulated that he should examine, ascertain the fact, proclaim it, and declare its consequences. Thus he did in reality possess the power of deposing monarchs, and of absolving their subjects from oaths of fealty, but only those monarchs who were members of that federation, and in the case legally provided for, and by their concession, not by divine right, and during the term of that federation, and the existence of his commission. He governed the church by divine right, he deposed kings and absolved subjects from their allegiance by human concession. I preach the doctrines of my church by divine right, but I preach from this spot not by that right, but by the permission of others.

"It is not then a doctrine of our church, that the Pope has been divinely commissioned either to depose kings or to interfere with republics, or to absolve the subjects of the former from their allegiance, or interfere with the civil concerns of the latter. When the persecuted English Catholics under Elizabeth, found the Pope making an unfounded claim to this right, and upon the shadow of that unfounded right making inroads upon their national independence, by declaring who should or who should not be their temporal ruler, they well showed how little they regarded his absolving them from their allegiance, for they volunteered their services to protect their liberties, which their Catholic ancestors had laboured to establish. And she well found that a Catholic might safely be entrusted with the admiralty of her fleet, and that her person was secure amongst her disgraced Catholic nobility and gentry and their persecuted adherents; although the Court of Rome had issued its bull of absolution, and some divines were found who endeavoured to prove that what originated in voluntary concessions of states and monarchs was derived from divine institution. If then,

Elizabeth, of whose character I would not wish in this place to express my opinion, was safe amidst those whom she persecuted for their faith, even when the head of the church absolved them from allegiance, and if at such a moment they flocked round her standard to repel Catholic invaders who came with consecrated banners, and that it is admitted on all hands that in so doing they violate no principle of doctrine, or of discipline of their church, as we all avow: surely America need not fear for the fidelity of her Catholic citizens, whom she cherishes, and whom she receives to her bosom with affection and shelters from the persecution of others. Neither will any person attempt to establish an analogy between our federation and that of feudalism, to argue that the Pope can do amongst us what he did amongst European potentates under circumstances widely different."

I now, sir, have noticed as briefly as I could your charge, and I receive your exhortation as I should all such addresses, with the disposition to reap from it as much useful instruction as it can impart, without regarding what was the motive with which it was given; and still farther feeling the obligation of supposing that motive good, until I shall have evidence to the contrary.

Reciprocating your expressions of charity and kind feeling,

I have the honour to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

BEAUFORT, S. C., Sept. 28, 1839.

To the Right Reverend Bishop England,

Reverend Sir:—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of two long communications from you since my last—one containing much Billingsgate abuse of Protestants by the editor of a furious Roman Catholic newspaper in Cork—and the other kindly furnishing me with copious extracts from an oration by yourself. As to the latter, it would be a cruelty quite revolting to my feelings, I assure you, to disturb the complacent satisfaction with which you regard your production. I once heard, in this town, your efforts to modify and mitigate the practices of Romanism; and I then charitably hoped there might be something in them. I have since, however, visited Rome; and I need not tell you with what emotions I should now listen to these ingenious and ambidextrous essays. The passage of your address, with which you favour me, must have provoked a smile from those of your audience who were acquainted with facts. And you did well to anticipate the verdict of history and

to cover and protect your assertions, by shrewdly observing that you "had seldom found a writer, not a Catholic, (you ought to have said, too, an expurgated Catholic) who, in treating of that age and that system, has been accurate"—that is, they all contradict your statements.

In reference to the *Cork Reporter*, and its virulence—of which you are so enamoured that you have italicised all the profusion of scurrilous epithets, I beg leave to remark, that I wish to see the other side before I form any opinion. I, sir, am neither an Irishman, nor a Roman Catholic, but were I both, as you are, I could never think of Ireland without anguished soul. Only read, I pray you, the appalling testimony recorded in several late numbers of *Blackwood,* and our hearts beat very differently, if you do not weep for the beautiful, but blighted island which gave you birth, and blush for the professors of your religion there. I do entreat our readers to procure from Mr. Berrett's at least one number of *Blackwood*—that for February, 1839—and study the article *Ireland under the Triple Alliance*; and then, to look at your homily upon the martyrs to integrity and truth! the heroes—whose glory is blazoned "by the hand of desolation in characters of plunder, of blood, of confiscation, of tyranny, of ruin, to which paganism affords no parallel," (were you thinking of the St. Bartholomew's massacre, or of the Inquisition when you wrote this? it might pass for a tolerable description of either,) and on whom "Protestantism proclaims to the universe, that the strongest bond is the sanctity of an oath"—that is, an oath which the policy of Rome, and the priestcraft of the Vatican approves.

Your last letter reiterates the unfounded charge against Faber, and is garnished here and there, I am sorry to find, with some expressions, which show that in recovering your prolixity, you have lost your temper. This should not have been: St. Paul says, "A bishop must not be soon angry." The public must judge of the Lateran decree and your commentary upon it. Mr. Faber may, I think, confidently submit to the decision of all who will examine the canon, and look to its practical exposition in the conduct of your church—for example, the perfidious treachery by which John Huss was decoyed to the Council of Constance, and cruelly murdered. For myself, I perceive clearly that your council and doctrines are even more accommodating in "dodging places," than the court of Rome, and that to pursue you farther, will be only a waste of time, for which I have other and more congenial employment. What? that "heretics were to be extirpated," only a "special law" too! ! This, sir, is venturing too far, even for you.

When I said that it would be as unfair in me to accuse you of garbling as it was in you to impute this dishonesty to Faber, I never deemed it

possible for you to wrest my words into anything like discourtesy. And it appears, sir, to me that a little more courtesy, on your part, would have suppressed the terms "injustice" and "distort," which you use; and, even, if I misconceived your argument have found apology in your own, I will not call it studied obscurity. I always thought it a hard case, that Daniel should have been required, not only to interpret the dream of King Nebuchadnezzar, but to discover what the dream was? Let this, however, pass. I rejoice sincerely at your disclaimer of sentiments, I before declared myself "unwilling to believe you would continue to uphold, whatever the Lateran Council may have taught." And I leave our readers to compare your first argument, with this last and expurgated version of it.

I have the honour to remain,

Reverend sir,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

RICHARD FULLER.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 8, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT,

Reverend Sir:—When your last letter appeared upon the *Courier,* I was scarcely able to read, and totally unable to write. I take advantage of the first moment that a return of health permits the use of my pen to pay my respects to your production. Some of my friends have sought to dissuade me from answering that letter, but I differ from their opinion, not in the hope of inducing you to change your view, but to afford to those who may think proper to read what I publish, the means of judging more correctly of the value of your assertions.

In your affecting to take leave of me, you have hitherto contrived to fling some new weapon, and thus afforded occasion to continue what you profess a desire of terminating. You have thus brought John Huss, and the Council of Constance to support Mr. Faber. You have given to me the massacre of St. Bartholomew's and the Inquisition, as subjects of meditation; and you have advised me to weep for the beautiful, but blighted island that gave me birth, and to blush for the professors of my religion there. All this, sir, is new matter; and I shall not, whatever may be the labour, the inconvenience, or the expense, leave it without those observations which I consider are demanded by the position which I occupy, and the just expectation of some of my fellow-citizens.

I begin with John Huss and the Council of Constance. You say,

that you look for the practical exposition of the Lateran decree, in the conduct of my church, "for example, the perfidious treachery by which John Huss was decoyed to the Council of Constance, and cruelly murdered."

The statement given by several Protestant writers, is, that John Huss was invited to the city of Constance, under the assurance by the Emperor Sigismund, and by the council, that he should have full protection in going thither, in remaining there, and pleading his cause, and in returning home unmolested, whether he should be found guilty or innocent of the charges alleged against him. That he had the safe-conduct, not only of the Emperor but of the Pope and council to this effect, and came to Constance, relying upon their plighted faith, and that he would not have come except upon this guaranty, and having been thus decoyed, he was in a treacherous way perfidiously and cruelly murdered, having been burned in execution of a sentence passed by the council. I know not how many of these allegations you are disposed to sustain, but I give your own words above.

I shall now examine this charge, as briefly as I can, and though I could avail myself of a host of witnesses, chiefly Catholic, I shall confine myself to the testimony of a Protestant writer, L'Enfant, who compiled a history of this council, which he dedicated to Frederic William King of Prussia, in 1713.

The assertion that the Pope and council gave a safe-conduct, rests upon the unsupported surmise of, I believe, Dr. Cave: others have repeated it. But L'Enfant informs us,[40] that John Huss arrived in Constance, on the 3d of November, 1414, the very day on which the council was to have been opened, and when it was not yet organized, and had done no act whatever, of course had give no guaranty. He tells us[41] that on the day after the arrival of Huss, two Bohemian lords who had escorted him waited on the Pope, and informed him that John Huss had arrived, and had the safe-conduct of the Emperor Sigismund, and requested the Pope's protection. That they were kindly received, and assured by the Pope that he would protect Huss against any injustice so long as he would remain in Constance. Thus it is clear that he was not decoyed to that city by any protection from the Pope or the council. L'Enfant adds, that Huss wrote to his friends that he not only had full liberty, but that the Pope absolved him from an excommunication which he had previously incurred, upon condition that he would not attempt to officiate or to preach in Constance. The council was not

[40] L'Enfaut, *Hist. Council Constant.* Liv. 1, parg. 21.
[41] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 28.

opened until the 5th of November.[42] Thus he had arrived in Constance without any guaranty from the Pope, and without any from the council, and two days previous to the organization of that assembly; and the extent of the Pope's promise after his arrival was that he would protect him against injustice. If then he was decoyed to Constance it was not by the Pope or by the council. Neither L'Enfant, nor any of the authors whom he consulted, and they were chiefly Hussites, alleges that he had any other guaranty save that given by the Emperor; and when the Bohemian lords demanded that he should be heard publicly before the council in his defence, they do not allege that he had any protection from that assembly, but they pleaded that the Emperor gave him a safe-conduct with an assurance that he should be heard before the fathers,[43] and, in the previous paragraph,[44] an elaborate argument is used to show that only one safe-conduct, viz., that of the Emperor, was ever given. And[45] John Huss himself, alleges his having come to the council of his own accord, and with the safe-conduct of the Emperor, and never alludes to any other. Thus the assertion that he was decoyed by the promise of protection and with the guaranty and safe-conduct of the Pope and council is a pure invention; and not only void of foundation in fact, but as ridiculous as unfounded, because the giving of such a passport and protection would be not an attribute of the Pope and council, but of the temporal government.

I now proceed to examine whether he was decoyed to Constance by the document which he received from Sigismund.

L'Enfant informs us[46] that in consequence of his having been charged with divers errors and heresies, he had appealed to the council; he was cited to appear there, he was anxious to have the opportunity of defending himself, for he was conscious of his innocence, and that had he not gone, it would seem as if he had no confidence in the justice of his cause, and relied upon the support of the great men of Bohemia to sustain him in opposition to his superiors. In the next paragraph,[47] he informs us that when the period for the meeting of the council approached, he took the proper measures for his defence, and that in the month of August, 1414, he requested and obtained certificates of his orthodoxy from Conrad, Archbishop of Prague, and from the Bishop of Nazareth, inquisitor of the faith in Bohemia. In this same month, a provincial

[42] L'Enfant, *Hist. Council Constant.* Liv. 1, parg. 30.
[43] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 60.
[44] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 59.
[45] *Ibid.* 3, parg. 47.
[46] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 25.
[47] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 26.

council was held at Prague, to which he demanded admittance, for the purpose of explaining his doctrine, and to notify the members that he was about to proceed to Constance for the same purpose. Admittance was refused, and he procured a notary to certify this refusal, and had it subscribed by many witnesses, and copies of it posted up in the most public places in the city. In that posted at the palace gates, he states his determination to go to Constance, and present himself for examination to the council, and if he should there be convicted of heresy, he would not refuse to submit to all the pains and penalties enacted against heretics.

He left Prague on or about the 11th of October,[48] and the date of the safe-conduct or passport, which he got from Sigismund, was a week later, October 18, as appears from the copy given by this historian.[49] John Huss did not receive it until he arrived at Nuremberg, on the 22d, so that he was not decoyed by this document, to set out upon a journey, in which he had been already engaged ten or eleven days, and for which he had been preparing more than three months, and of which he had already accomplished one-half, and was now at a considerable distance beyond the Bohemian frontier.

The next question regards the nature of the safe-conduct. Was it a document to insure pardon and impunity to a man, charged with a crime, should he be found guilty, or merely to protect him from illegal violence? If it were of the first description, the process of his trial would be a farce. His own declarations, in the notices which he gave at Prague and elsewhere, showed that he was aware of the laws by which heretics were punished in that territory, and that under which he suffered had been enacted, nearly two centuries before, by Frederic II. I am no advocate for the law itself. I feel equal disgust at the burning of Huss as I do at the burning of Servetus. The question is not whether the law was just, or wise, or humane, but whether the punishment of Huss was a treacherous violation of the public faith, by the Council of Constance, or only an execution of a law, then in force, by the proper officers.

It is, I believe, a well-known maxim of legal interpretation, that a document, containing only general expressions of protection, such as are used on ordinary occasions, cannot be pleaded as a pardon, or a protection against a legal process. Now the safe-conduct, as given by L'Enfant, is no more than a common passport to John Huss, going from Bohemia to the Council of Constance, to go, to remain, and to return,

[48] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 27.
[49] *Ibid.* 1, parg. 41.

with this special addition, that neither he nor his companions were to be charged anything on their journey, for dues or customs, and were to be furnished, honourably and sufficiently, with every necessary, free of expense. And as the Emperor Sigismund had written to Wenceslaus, King of Bohemia, to send Huss to the council, to which he had appealed, and to appear before which he had been cited, there was no decoying, but an open order, and the passport was given to protect him on his way thither, and to furnish him with the means of going, so that he might prosecute his appeal, and abide the judgment of that tribunal. The passport does not contain a single expression which would even insinuate that the bearer was to be exempted from the operation of the law. If it were a protection and a pardon, it would be a ridiculous farce, and wanton waste of time, to hold a trial, yet he went to take that trial. L'Enfant labours hard to draw a different conclusion, and to convict Sigismund of a breach of faith, but he cannot change the nature of the facts which he is obliged to admit. He gives us abundant evidence, that Huss himself, though trusting to an acquittal, feared for the result at Constance, and he tells us, that though Huss had many enemies in Germany, from whom he had much to fear, on the way, except he had the Emperor's protection; yet, they were so certain of his conviction, that they were not likely to molest him on his way to trial. He also tells us, that in a sort of will, which he wrote to one of his friends, previous to his leaving Prague, he wrote on the envelope, that it was not to be opened until certain news of his death should be received. He also tells us of another letter, written to another friend, in which he states that he is aware of the number of enemies he must encounter at Constance, and begs that the friends of truth would pray for him, that he might persevere in his resolution of suffering the last punishment, sooner than betray the Gospel by his weakness. Again, he requests that they should aid him by their prayers, that if condemned, he may glorify God by a Christian death, or if it should be given to him to return to Prague, he may return innocent, to labour with renewed zeal in extirpating the doctrine of Anti-christ. Thus he went to Constance with a full knowledge of his precise position, and was not decoyed thither.

We have his own testimony in one of his letters that the Pope absolved him from an excommunication previously incurred, but on certain conditions. L'Enfant [50] does not acknowledge that Huss violated the conditions, yet he establishes the fact in an effort to mitigate the offence. He says that, relying upon the emperor's protection, and the

[50] L'Enfant, *Hist. Council Constant.* Liv. 1, parg. 37.

word of the Pope, *il y parloit avec assez de liberte, soutenant sa doctrine, soit dans ses conversations, soit dans les ecrits qu'il composoit.* "He spoke with abundant liberty, sustaining his doctrine, as well by his conversations as by written compositions." This was a glaring violation of the condition that he should not dogmatize, but quietly wait to justify himself to the council. It is also acknowledged that he violated another condition, by celebrating Mass publicly every day. One thing is evident: that he had been excommunicated previously, and we have only his own assertion that he was relieved from this censure; and we have the allegations of contemporary historians who took part in the proceedings of the council that he was not relieved from that censure: L'Enfant, does not believe their assertion. Neither does he believe their statement that Huss made an effort to escape from Constance, and was brought back a prisoner. He was, after an examination, placed in custody, his friends say, without any sufficient ground, and in violation of the safe-conduct. Their opponents state abundant reasons for this proceeding. After a variety of examinations, some of his friends foreseeing what the result must be, sought to catch at the only pretext which they could turn to any account, and pleaded that the Emperor had promised to protect him. It is fair to allow the emperor to speak for himself. On the 1st of January, 1415, in a public assembly, he answered a request of the commissaries of the cause of religion, amongst other things,[51] "That the council was free in all that regarded faith, and that it could proceed according to the usual rules against those who were notoriously attainted for heresy, and judge them according to their deserts, after having given them a public hearing, and as regarding the threats which had been made in certain places and in certain writings in favour of John Huss, his majesty had forbidden their being carried into effect, and would still prevent it if necessary."

One thing was plain, that no law or act of any temporal power could prevent the council from exercising its inalienable right of deciding whether a person taught the doctrine delivered by Christ to the church, or what contradicted it: but the temporal punishment of the person condemned for heresy, was not within the competence of the council, and was altogether a matter for the civil government. The emperor could not rightfully interfere in the doctrinal examination and decision, but it lay with him whether he would inflict bodily punishment upon the person condemned by the council. There is no evidence that Sigismund ever promised to save Huss from the operation of the law of Frederic.

[51] L'Enfant, *Hist. Council Constant.* Liv. 1, parg. 57.

It was now too plain that Huss must be condemned unless he retracted, and no effort was spared to induce him to make the necessary retraction; his answer generally was, that when he should be convinced that his doctrines were erroneous, he would retract, but not otherwise. He was, by order of the emperor, brought before the council, and the historian L'Enfant informs us that the session broke up after much tumult. His second public audience was on Friday, the 7th of June, 1415; the emperor was present, and the audience was very long. At its termination,[52] the emperor says, respecting the safe-conduct, "under the protection of which we have placed you, to the end that no wrong should be done to you, (*qu'il ne vous fut fait aucun tort,*) and that you may speak freely and give account of your faith (*rendre raison de votre foi*) in full council." Thus we have from Sigismund himself, in his address publicly made to Huss, the testimony of the nature of the document. And he proceeds to say that the cardinals and bishops had answered so well to his intentions that he knows not how to thank them. He then exhorts Huss to submit to the council upon those articles which have been so well and so solidly proved against him, and that he will himself do his utmost to have him return with honour and in safety. He warns him, on the other hand, that if he did not submit, the council must do its duty in condemning him, and that the emperor, so far from sustaining him in his errors and obstinacy would sooner, with his own hands, light the fire for his punishment, than tolerate him longer. Huss began by thanking the emperor for his safe-conduct, but one of his chief supporters, John de Chlum, stopped him, and urged him to disprove the charge of obstinacy, which he undertook by repeating that he had willingly come to retract errors if the council could convince him that he had taught any.

On the next day he had a third public audience, which occupied the entire day, but with no better results. Before the separation of the council, after Huss had retired, the Emperor addressed the fathers, stating that the guilt of the accused appeared to him so manifest by the testimony of the witnesses and his own avowals, and the charges were so grievous, that even if he were now to retract, his return to Bohemia would be the ruin of that kingdom; and that the principles were so pernicious that they should be nowhere tolerated. They were congenial to those of the Lollards in England, of whom I need give no description to those who have read an account of the reign of Henry V.

With such evidence before any dispassionate reader, I should think

[52] L'Enfant, *Hist. Council Constant.* Liv. 3, parg. 6.

he would consider it very unreasonable to charge upon the Pope and Council and Emperor, that they had decoyed John Huss to Constance, or that they acted with perfidious treachery, in trying the appeal which he made himself by a process of law with which he was fully acquainted; and in endeavouring to save him from its effects by using all means to induce him to retract the principles, the maintenance of which exposed him to death. Nor do I believe that any impartial inquirer will charge Sigismund with a breach of faith, in not saving from legal punishment a convict to whom he gave a passport protecting him from wrong or injury on his journey to the place where he was to take his trial.

On the day after his third audience, an exceedingly modified form of retraction and submission was presented to Huss,[53] upon the signing of which the impending danger would be averted, but he refused to sign. On the 1st of July a deputation of two cardinals, and a number of prelates presented to Huss, whose life they were anxious to save, another form of submission, which he refused.[54] On the fifth of the month, the Emperor sent four bishops with two of Huss's particular friends to make a last effort, but in vain. The conclusion which several Protestant historians endeavour to draw from these repeated efforts is, that the Emperor had his conscience troubled because of his having violated the safe-conduct. On the other hand, the conclusion is drawn that these efforts were the evidence of the reluctance which existed on the part of those, in whose hands the unfortunate victim was placed, to execute a severe law which they felt it was their duty to carry into effect.

The case of Huss is one on which much declamation has been expended without a sufficient acquaintance with the facts; and I have therefore preferred being prolix that I may furnish our readers with sufficient data to form a correct judgment, and to see the grounds upon which I assert, 1st. That this unfortunate man was not decoyed to Constance. 2d. That neither the Pope nor council gave him any safe-conduct or guaranty. 3d. That the passport of Sigismund was only a protection for his journey and against injustice, and not a pardon, or a protection against due process of law. 4th. That his trial was according to the well known forms, upon his own seeking, and that he was fully aware of the penalty which the laws of Frederic attached to his conviction. 5th. That so far from an effort having been made by perfidious treachery to procure his murder, many delays were inter-

[53] L'Enfant, *Hist. Council Constant.* Liv. 3, parg. 13.
[54] *Ibid.* 3, parg. 36.

posed and a variety of efforts were made to avoid the necessity of having him subjected to the legal penalty of death.

On the 6th of July, Huss having been brought before the council and the usual process gone through, two sentences were promulgated: the first against his books, which were condemned and ordered to be burned; the second against himself,—that he, being convicted as an obstinate and incorrigible heretic, should be degraded from his orders, and deprived of his clerical privileges. The form for executing this sentence was gone through in the church where they were assembled. The authority of the council ended here, they had no power over his body. The Emperor ordered the Elector Palatine to carry into execution the law of the empire as was his duty, and the magistrates of the city of Constance had it executed not however, until, even at the fatal stake, repeated efforts were made by the Elector Palatine, and Count Oppenheim, the marshal of the empire, to induce him to save his life by a retraction, which he would not make.

Sir, my soul is not one of those which rejoice in scenes of fire and of blood. I condemn the errors of John Huss. I lament his fate, but deny that he was decoyed to Constance, or that he was treated with perfidy. To me it is matter of singular consolation that those bloody laws, which Catholics and Protestants both made for the purpose of persecution, have been nearly obliterated; but I deeply lament that in our republics, where political liberty has established her throne, so much of the bitter spirit which gave to those laws existence and virulence should still remain; and it is one of the phenomena which, though apparently strange, is still easily accounted for, why the Catholic Church, which was the first to proclaim religious liberty within our borders, is that which has at all times experienced more or less persecutions, and is to-day, in our republics, the object of so much misrepresentation and obloquy.

I have the honour to remain, reverend sir,

Your obedient and humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 15, 1839.

To the Reverend Richard Fuller,

BEAUFORT,

Reverend Sir:—I regretted to find that you had been so far carried away by the misrepresentations of the writers in *Blackwood*, as to use against an oppressed people the phrase of contemptuous irony, in

which the domineering tories of Great Britain and their retainers insult the Catholics of Ireland, "martyrs to integrity and truth," "heroes whose glory is blazoned by the hand of desolation in characters of plunder, of blood, of confiscation, of tyranny and ruin, to which paganism affords no parallel." Sir, I shall not impute it to a disposition to insult. I attribute it to your having been misinformed: as you certainly must have been, when you rely upon the statements of *Blackwood's Magazine* respecting Ireland.

Sir, when I wrote the passage which you dove-tailed as above, to follow the undeserved taunt that you gave at its introduction, I was not thinking of St. Bartholomew's massacre, which was but the horrible butchery of a few hours, and for which the Catholic church is not answerable: but I was viewing the cool, deliberate, legalized, systematic persecution of ages. I was indeed thinking of an inquisition, which in a comparatively short period shed more blood within the compass of one island, than was shed of Protestant blood by all the *auto-da-fès* of the Inquisition in Catholic countries from the period of its creation to that of its abolition. I intended to describe the losses and the sufferings of the Irish Catholics, and amongst them those of my own ancestors, because they would not swear to what they did not believe. Sir, I am a native of Ireland, and I am a Catholic, and I cannot reflect without anguish of soul upon what I myself have seen in "that beautiful but blighted island, which gave me birth;" but so far from blushing for the professors of my religion there, I am proud of their history, and I glory in their conduct to-day. When the Catholics of Ireland held power in their hands, they never returned evil for evil to their persecutors. During the reign of Mary, when she retaliated upon those who persecuted and sought to deprive her of her crown, the Catholics of Ireland not only did not persecute the comparatively few Protestants that were in the country, but they received with open arms, and they protected and housed and fed great numbers of English Protestants who sought an asylum amongst them. When Elizabeth succeeded, they were scourged with scorpions. Read the description given by even their own enemies of their suffering under the Stuarts and the Protector. Again, when James II. fled from England, the Catholics of Ireland had the government of their island in their hands, and blotting from their memories the atrocities which covered their home with those evils which I attempted briefly to describe, not one Protestant suffered either in person or in property for his religion or the misdeeds of his party! Sir, I am proud of knowing that, in the body which thus made so Christian-like a use of their power, was a progenitor of mine, and I trust that you

will not have the cruelty to disturb the complacent satisfaction with which I regard this honour! Blackwood has not informed you, that previous to subscribing the treaty of Limerick, by which the possession of their property, the freedom of their religion, and the enjoyment of their political rights, were guaranteed to the Catholics of Ireland; the men who stood ready on the part of those Catholics to subscribe, were told not to affix their signatures, for that a fleet was at the mouth of the river with such a force to aid them, as would enable them to sweep their enemies from the land; but that their answer was, "Though we have not written our names on the parchment, we have promised to do so; our faith and our honour are pledged to the contract. We cannot recede." They signed: so did their enemies. They disbanded their troops: they sent back the succours, they were scattered through the country. They found that no faith was kept with them: the description that I gave was but the faint exhibition of their children's endurance! Is it on my cheek that the blush should mantle?

More than forty-five years have passed away since a man, then about sixty years of age, led me into a prison, and showed me the room in which he had been confined, during upwards of four years, in consequence of the injustice to which the Catholics of Ireland were subjected in those days of persecution. On the day that he was immured, his wife was seized upon by fever, the result of terror: whilst she lay on her bed of sickness, she and her family were dispossessed of the last remnant of their land and furniture: she was removed to the house of a neighbour, to breathe her last under a stranger's roof. Her eldest child had completed his 17th year a few days before he closed her grave. Two younger brothers and two younger sisters looked to him as their only support. He endeavoured to turn his education to account. It was discovered that he was a Papist, as the law contumeliously designated a Roman Catholic, and that he was guilty of teaching some propositions of the sixth book of Euclid to a few scholars, that he might be able to aid his father, and to support his family. Informations were lodged against him for this violation of the law, which rendered him liable to transportation. Compassion was taken upon his youth and misfortunes, and instead of proceeding immediately to the prosecution, an opportunity was given him of swearing before the Protestant bishop, that he did not believe in the doctrines of transubstantiation, of penance, and of the invocation of saints; and the certificate of the prelate would raise a bar to his prosecution. This youth knew no principle of his church which could excuse his perjury. He escaped, and fled into the mountains, where he remained during more than a year, subsisting upon

the charity of those to whose children he still communicated the rudiments of learning, but in the most painful anxiety as to the state of his father, brother, and sisters!

The declaration of American independence, and the successful resistance of the colonies, produced some mitigation of the persecutions which the Irish Catholics endured. This fugitive returned by stealth to the city, and was enabled to undertake the duties of a land surveyor, to have his parent liberated, his family settled, and he became prosperous. It is his eldest son who has the honour to inform you that he has good reason to feel anguish of soul at his own recollection of the oppression of Ireland. Few have, during upwards of twelve years of the administration of the Tory faction of England, had better opportunities of knowing thoroughly the source of her evils than he had. It is a revolting history. It is the history of the efforts of a bad and a hypocritical faction to perpetuate the power of a miserable minority to live in idleness, and affluence, and insolence, upon the labours and the degradation of the mass of the population.

Sir, I know the writers for *Blackwood*, some of them from their childhood. It is not long since, from some of their own compeers, I learned in London the history and the terms of their engagements. I was myself engaged for no inconsiderable period amongst the conductors of the public press in Ireland, and I well know the mode of manufacturing information for the Tory press of the British metropolis. And unfortunately, the information respecting Ireland, and especially respecting Irish Catholics, which our American editors generally select for diffusion through these republics, is from that portion of the English writers. Nor can it be said that there is a disrelish for it here. Hence the Irish Catholics are generally subject to the consequences of misrepresentations and mistake in a greater degree in the United States than they are even in the British islands. I am not then surprised at the incorrect views which you have taken, nor disposed to attribute to any innate hatred to Ireland the sneers with which you are pleased to treat those "martyrs to integrity and truth,"—the Catholic body of Ireland.

As my views of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's are pretty nearly the same as those expressed by the late Right Reverend Doctor Milner, I shall lay before our readers what he says upon the subject in the following extract:[55]

"With respect to the horrid deed itself of blood and perfidy, I will not attempt

[55] Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, No. 4, on the Massacre of Paris, on St. Bartholomew's Eve.

to justify it, as the king, the queen-dowager, and their ministers did, at the time when it happened, by pretending that the Huguenots were on the point of executing a plot to destroy them, and to overturn the government,[56] because it is now clear from history that no such plot existed at that precise time. I will not even extenuate its atrociousness by expatiating on the two real conspiracies for seizing on this very king and his court, and for subverting the constitution of their country, which the Calvinists actually attempted to execute,[57] or on the four pitched battles which they had fought against the armies of their sovereign, or on their treachery in delivering up Harve de Grace, the key of the kingdom, into the hands of a foreign potentate, Queen Elizabeth; or even upon the massacres with which they themselves had previously inundated all France.[58] So far from this, I am ready to exclaim with Thuanus, or with yourself, in contemplating the horrors of St. Bartholomew's day, *Excidat illa dies aevo, nec protera credant saecula.*[59] But, sir, let the blame fall where it is due, on the black vengeance of the unrelenting Charles IX., and on the remorseless ambition of the unprincipled Catharine of Medicis, who alternately favoured the Catholics and Huguenots, as seemed best to suit her own interest. The very calumny that I mentioned before, which the king and queen invented to excuse their barbarity, is a sufficient proof that they did not conceive it lawful to commit such crimes to serve their religion,[60] for which, indeed, neither of them felt much zeal: and as this savage villainy was contrived without the participation of a single individual of the French clergy, so that body was most forward at the time to oppose its completion,[61] and has ever since been the most warm in reprobating it.''[62]

Here, sir, I conclude. I leave before our readers what I have

[56] Maimburg, *Hist. Calvin*, l. vi.

[57] Those of Amboix and Meaux, the latter of which appeared so heinous in the king's eyes, that he vowed never to forgive it. The Huguenots had before, when they took up arms against him, in 1562, threatened him with the greatest indignities, namely, to whip him and bind him apprentice to a mechanical trade. (*Ibid.* l. iv.). It appears from Thuanus, that his chief resentment was directed against Coligni, and that it was the murder of him which drew on that of the other Protestants.

[58] I do not speak of the innumerable massacres committed by the Calvinists of France upon priests, religious, and other unarmed people, during the civil wars which they carried on against their sovereigns, some of which have been already noticed. Davila relates, that upon the death of Francis II, when liberty of conscience was granted them, besides burning down churches and monasteries, they massacred people in the very streets of Paris. Heylen relates, that in the time of a profound peace, the same people, taking offence at the procession of Corpus Christi, performed in the city of Pamiers, fell upon the whole clergy who composed it, and murdered them: and that they afterwards committed the same outrages at Montauban, Rodez, Valence, and so forth. *Hist. Presb.* l. ii.

[59] Thuan. *ex Statio.*

[60] This further appears from the proclamation of Charles, immediately after the massacre: *Eodem die edictum promulgatur, quo rex testabatur quidquid in hac re accidisset suo diserto mandato gestum esse, non religionis odio, sed ut nefariae Colinii et sociorum conjurationi obviam iret.* Thuan. l. liii.

[61] It is particularly recorded of Henuyer, a Dominican friar and Bishop of Lisieux, that he opposed to the utmost of his power the execution of the king's order for the murder of the Protestants in his diocess, answering the governor of the province, when he communicated it to him: ''It is the duty of the good shepherd to lay down his life for his sheep, not to let them be slaughtered before his face. These are my sheep, though they have gone astray, and I am resolved to run all hazards in protecting them.'' Maimb.

[62] See Maimb. Contin. Fleury, and so forth.

by a sense of duty been compelled to write. They who have had the patience to follow us will each for himself determine—

1st. Whether the Roman Chancery ever passed a statute making assassination, and murder, and prostitution, and every crime, subjects of license and taxation, and regulating the price at which each might be committed?

2d. Whether the Protestant editions of the Roman *Tax-book* are true copies of that work or have been glaringly interpolated?

3d. Whether you have adduced any evidence to sustain the charge against Sixtus IV., that he established brothels in Rome in order to put a tax upon them?

4th. Whether the third Council of Lateran made not only falsehood but perjury a virtue on behalf of the church?

5th. Whether G. S. Faber was guilty of dishonestly garbling the 16th canon of the third Council of Lateran?

6th. Whether the Council of Lateran taught as an article of Catholic doctrine that heretics are to be persecuted and destroyed?

7th. Whether it is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that the Pope has the right and power by divine institution, in virtue of his office, to depose princes and to absolve subjects or citizens from the obligation of their allegiance?

8th. Whether the Pope and Council of Constance violated their public faith given to John Huss?

9th. Whether the Emperor Sigismund violated the public faith, pledged by the passport which he gave to John Huss, on his journey from Prague to Constance?

10th. Whether the wretched state of Ireland is to be attributed to the turbulence of its Roman Catholic population rather than the tyranny of their persecutors? And,

11th. Whether the conduct of the professors of my religion in Ireland is such as to call for blushes on my cheek?

Such are the questions which have arisen and been discussed. I am compelled to close, whether I will or not. And even should you rejoin upon any of those topics or introduce a new one, it is probable that I shall not be in this city when your remarks shall appear. My duties call me away from it immediately, if by any effort I can make arrangements to permit my absence. And even should I remain, or upon my return, other indispensable avocations will allow me no leisure, for some time, to write. This is, therefore, probably the last time that I shall address you. I desire that our separation may be in charity and peace. To our readers I leave to judge of the value of our productions: to that

God who is to judge us, I commit the cognizance of our acts and their motives; whilst, for the last time,

I have the honour, reverend sir,
To subscribe myself,
Your obedient, humble servant,
JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

THE CONTROVERSY [63]

So far as the Bishop is concerned the controversy appears to be closed; there have been three other letters published by him besides those which appear upon our paper. He expressed his determination not to go farther, whether Rev. Mr. Fuller rejoins or not.

A number of the Protestant papers are publishing extracts from the interpolated *Tax-book*, to prove that it is genuine, because it exists!!!

"Others say that the Bishop denies that there was ever a genuine *Tax-book*. All of them call the items 'prices for the absolution of sin.' The most prominent of the latter is the Reverend Doctor Brownlee of New York, the great patron of Miss Maria Monk, who publishes that the Rev. Mr. Fuller, not having the means of proving his case, he, Brownlee, will supply his deficiency—and gives us a specimen. After having read both, we openly proclaim that Mr. Fuller is, as an advocate, infinitely superior to Brownlee, who has thus insulted him!!!"

As a sequel to the above, we beg leave to insert the following correspondence, which we have had in our hands since the 8th inst., and by some oversight omitted last week.

VESTRY OF ST. MARY'S CHURCH.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 25, 1839.

The following letter was transmitted to the Bishop, in consequence of the proceedings which it describes:

"*To the Right Reverend John England, Bishop of Charleston.*

"*Right Reverend Sir*:—At a meeting of the Vestry of St. Mary's Church in the city of Charleston, held on Sunday the 22d inst, the Rev. William Burke, assistant clergyman, presiding—the following resolutions, submitted by Mr. Ravina, and seconded by Mr. John E. Clay, were unanimously adopted, viz.:

"*Resolved*, That the thanks of this vestry be tendered to the Right Rev. Bishop England, for his able defence of the Catholic religion against the attacks made upon it by the Rev. Richard Fuller.

[63] From the *United States Catholic Miscellany* of October 19th, 1839.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of the above resolution be sent to the Bishop by the secretary.

"I beg leave, Right Reverend Sir, in compliance with the order thus given, to make to you the present communication; assuring you that no one more highly values your powerful advocacy of our cause more than I do.

"I have the honour to remain,

"Right Reverend Sir, respectfully,

"Your obedient, humble servant,

"CHAS. KANAPAUX,

"*Secretary to the Vestry.*"

To which the Bishop made the following reply:

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 7th, 1839.

To Charles Kanapaux, Esq., Secretary of the Vestry of St. Mary's Church.

Dear Sir:—Illness and its consequent debility prevented me from making an earlier reply to your communication of the 25th of last month.

I feel deeply indebted to the Vestry of St. Mary's Church for the kind manner in which they appreciate the performance of my duty.

The Rev. Mr. Fuller, misled by a host of writers who copied one of the earliest falsehoods that was invented to vilify our church, and to justify the secession of those who called themselves "Reformers," I am convinced, was honestly under the impression that the Protestant imitations of the *Tax-book* of the Roman tribunals, were exact and authentic copies of those books. At the outset of the correspondence, I have no doubt he was convinced that his authorities were good, and his case easily established; and I am certain that he anticipated an easy and a glorious triumph. Mr. Fuller has not studied those quotations with sufficient care, and he was not prepared for the difficulties that subsequently arose. The forgeries and the interpolations are not his. And it was neither the disposition nor the interest of those whom he regarded as high authority to admit, that they were what the Catholic world always proclaimed them to be, spurious suppositions. Nor is Mr. Fuller the only one of our fellow-citizens who looked upon the position which he undertook to defend, as impregnable. The delusion is spread widely abroad, not only amongst those who are poorly informed, but amongst those who are otherwise learned and worthy of esteem for their genius and acquirements. Nor is it to be destroyed in a day, nor in a month, nor in a year. But I am happy to perceive that the mind of America is awakened to the subject; and the result of investigation will

be the discovery of truth. In the process of the inquiry, I felt it to be my duty to treat this gentleman as one who combated for what he considered to be truth; though I regret much that he has introduced other topics, and treated them in a spirit which I cannot admire. As, however, the main question has been departed from, and other duties press upon me, I shall discontinue the discussion as soon as I can.

For yourself, sir, accept my thanks for the manner in which you were so kind as to make the communication; and believe me to be, with regard and esteem.

Yours, very sincerely and affectionately in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

BULL OF THE CRUSADES, AND CATHOLICITY IN SOUTH AMERICA

[This Essay, occasioned by an article in the *North American Review* for July, 1824, in which were contained some vague and general denunciations of the corruption of the Catholic religion in the South American States, is chiefly devoted to an exposure of some of the historical fallacies and misrepresentations of laws, usages, and doctrines, upon which such charges are usually founded. The greater part is occupied with an accurate explanation of the Bull of the Crusades and the Bull of Composition, with the special privileges enjoyed by force of these in the dominions of the King of Spain. The essay was published in the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for 1824.]

SECTION I

It is not without feelings of deep regret that we are compelled to charge the editor of the *North American Review* with having done serious injustice to our religion in his number for July last. We hope, we trust, it was on his part unintentional,—yet, whatever might have been his motive and his impression, the fact is that he has libelled the Roman Catholic religion. Were the facts which he alleges true, we should not dissent from his conclusions; for some of those he adduces the authority of writers whom he, we suppose, believed to be good witnesses. We would then exculpate him from so much; but he states other facts as if he had before him the documents upon which he rested as authority,—and if he had those documents, and read them with the slightest attention, upon reperusing his own article he must perceive a total aberration in his statements.

The article of which we complain is Article X. page 158, on South America. In all that he writes concerning the political bondage of the Spanish colonies, whatever our convictions or feelings may be, we at present have no concern. In all his hopes and wishes for the welfare and prosperity of our neighbouring republics, we most heartily concur. But in all that he has written concerning our religion, we beg to inform him, that he does not appear to be sufficiently acquainted with the subject of which he treats, and that he assumes as facts many things which are untrue.

In page 164 he informs us, that:

"In the future pages of our journal, we hope to exhibit from time to time as full

and minute a view of the revolutionary history of South America as the nature of our work will admit. We have access to materials, which we trust will enable us to do reasonable justice to a subject which is much less understood in this country than its merits deserve, or than our interests as a nation would seem to require,—especially when relations of the most intimate kind are daily gaining strength between the United States and the new republics at the South.''

This is a reason why we are the more anxious that he should be better informed as regards our religion; for we do not wish to be misrepresented to our fellow-citizens, and to the reading world, by an authority which is deservedly respected. We are aware that the editor condemns our religion as corrupted and superstitious; we are aware that he is under what we will call an erroneous impression, that it is unfavourable to republicanism. Upon these topics we think very differently from him; but this is not the ground of our complaint. We do not even object, that in page 192 he writes of Roman Catholics: ''The spiritual guides of the people were the worst enemies to their peace and happiness; precept and example conspired to scatter poison in the hearts of the unsuspecting, to corrupt the springs of good principle, and extinguish the light of moral truth.'' We do not complain of this, and more than this: we should blush to write it of the Unitarians; and when we designate this division of persons, it is not to charge them with being more corrupt than others, but to ask the editor of the *Review* what would be his feelings did we wantonly thus attack that body, to which we understand he belongs.

But we do complain that the whole portion of his article which describes the *Bulls of the Crusades*, is a palpable misstatement; and we do complain that his section on the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* is little better. As yet, we acquit the editor of the moral turpitude of intentional misrepresentations; but he must permit us to prove our assertion; and though our feelings have been deeply wounded, we shall, we trust, avoid that sort of disrespectful, we may call it contemptuous language, with which it is not even, by scholars and gentlemen, deemed illiberal to assail us. As we cannot, in our present number, give all the necessary explanation, we shall only insert the first portion which we mean to examine.

Extract from *North American Review*, No. xliv. for July, 1824, pages 186, 187, and 188:

''But the most extraordinary imposition in the whole catalogue, was the tax levied through the instrumentality of the church,—which practised on the credulity, corrupted the morals, and degraded the character of the people, at the same time it picked their pockets. As long ago as the time of the Crusades, bulls were granted by the Pope to certain Spaniards, allowing dispensations for the zeal they displayed in exterminating the infidels, and as an inducement to perseverance in so pious a

work. Custom, which establishes everything, brought these bulls into general use; and for many ages they have been palmed on the people in Spain, ignorant and wise, as possessing a virtue and a power which could only come from heaven. And, as if to fix the last seal of degradation on the Americans, these precious devices of superstition and crime were scattered profusely over the whole extent of the New World, and there employed, by alarming the religious fears of the people on the one hand, and encouraging their vices on the other, to wring from them the little that remained after the torturing engine of taxation had done its heaviest work.

"The bulls were issued every two years, sent over to America from Spain, and sold out by the priests under the direction of a commissary, appointed to superintend this branch of the revenue. They were of four kinds. 1. The bull for the living, or *Bula de Cruzada*, so called because it has some traditionary connexion with the Bulls of the Crusades. It was deemed essential for every person to possess this bull, and its virtues were innumerable. Whoever purchased it might be absolved from all crimes, except heresy, by any priest; and even of heresy he could never be suspected, with this shield to protect him. On fast days he might eat anything but meat, and on other days he was exempted from many of the rigorous injunctions of the church. Two of these bulls, if they had been paid for, communicated double the benefits of one.[64] 2. The bull for eating milk and eggs during Lent. This was intended only for ecclesiastics, and persons not holding the first, which entitled the possessor to all the advantages of both. 3. The bull of the dead, *Bula de Defuntos*, which was indispensable to rescue departed souls from purgatory. It was bought by the relations of a deceased person, as soon as possible after death; and poor people were thrown into agonies of grief and lamentation, if they were not able to purchase this passport for the spirit of a relative suffering the miseries of purgatory. 4. The Bull of Composition, which released persons who had stolen goods from the obligation to restore them to the owner. One slight condition, it is true, was attached to this bull, which was, that the person, when stealing, had not been moved thereto by any forethought of the virtue of a bull to make the property his own, and his conscience white. Bating this small condition, the bull converted all stolen goods into the true and lawful property of the thief. It had the power, moreover, to correct the moral offences of false weights and measures, tricks and fraud in trade, and, in short, all those little obliquities of principle and conduct, to which swindlers resort to rob honest people of their possessions. 'It assures the purchaser,' says Depons, 'the absolute property in whatever he may obtain, by modes that ought to have conducted him to the gallows.' The price of these bulls depended on the amount of goods

[64] The Laws of the Indies do not profess to determine the virtues of the *Bula de Cruzada*; they prescribe with great formality in what manner they shall be sold, and the revenue secured. The *Comissario de la Cruzada* possessed considerable authority independent of the viceroy. *Recop. de Ley*, Lib. i. Tit. 20.

Solorzano presents us with much curious information concerning the *Bula de Cruzada*, and says the reason why it was extended to two years, instead of one as in Spain, was the difficulty of sending them to the remote provinces in South America in so short a time; and if no more than one year were allowed, their virtue would be destroyed before they could be received by the people. Some of the Spanish writers complained that this was an undue indulgence, and that the revenue suffered by it. Solorzano thinks otherwise, as by shortening the time, the sales would be much diminished in the interior, where the bulls would arrive too late. Besides, he says the plan of retaining the virtue in the bulls for two years was sanctioned by Pope Gregory the Thirteenth, as early as 1578.—*Politica Indiana*, compaesta por el S. D. J. Solorzano i Pereyra Lib. IV, cap. 25.

stolen; but it is just to add, that only fifty of them could be taken by the same person in a year.

"The price of the *Bula de Cruzada* was fixed by the commissary, and varied according to the quality of the purchasers. In the mandate of the commissary general for the year 1801, he says, 'the price is a little raised, but it is on account of the new expenses of the government, and of the necessity of extinguishing the royal certificates, which the scarcity of money in a time of war has compelled the king to issue.' At that time a viceroy paid fifteen dollars, and other persons of wealth and distinction paid five. If any man practised deception in this matter, and bought a bull at a lower rate than his rank or property demanded, the bull was without virtue, —and the purchaser had the comfort of reflecting, that he had defrauded himself, and thrown away his money. Such a deception was seldom known, even where the amount of the man's property had escaped the scrutiny of the officers; and no sources of the revenue were more certain and productive than this scandalous traffic in scraps of brown paper. It must be remembered, that these bulls were available for two years only, and then the people were again to be plundered by this infamous, juggling artifice to stir up their passions and interests, and even to quicken their crimes, where this could be done with a better prospect of grasping their money. But this league of the powers of darkness is fast dissolving; religion could not be mocked, nor justice outraged any longer; and if the revolution had done no other thing than relieve the minds of sixteen millions of people from a thraldom so barbarous and debasing, the deed would of itself be a good reward for the sacrifices and sufferings thus far endured by the South Americans in gaining their independence."

The history of the origin and continuance of these bulls, might at first sight appear of no importance to their present nature; however, such an impression would be erroneous, for without some knowledge of their history, it would be impossible to have a correct idea of their nature. We shall, therefore, as briefly as possible, give such a sketch as will be, we trust, sufficient. In page 184 of the *Review*, the editor has the following passage:

"The *alcavalda* originated in Old Spain during the wars against the Moors, and was granted to defray the expenses of those wars. It was limited to three years, but was afterwards extended; and against all the principles of equitable government, it was entailed as an eternal inheritance on the Spanish provinces in South America."

Now, our object is not to advocate either this tax upon sales which is here described, nor to enter into an examination of the justice or injustice of extending it to the American colonies,—but to show a fact, viz., that the tax for defraying the expenses of the wars against the Moors was extended to New Spain, as well as to Old Spain.

We find another fact which is acknowledged by the reviewer in page 196, viz.: That in the year 1519, Charles V. changed the nature of the government, making the American territory an integral part of the Spanish kingdom. In point of law, therefore, we apprehend it would not be very preposterous to assert, that the taxes to which one portion of the kingdom was liable, might be extended to the other portion. The

Americans might not have been fairly dealt with, either by their own local rulers, by the Council of the Indies, or by the king,—but still this would not destroy the principle of the liability to taxation. We also find the fact that they were made liable to the tax *alcavalda*, which was imposed to defray the expense of the Moorish wars. Upon the same principle they were made liable to the tax of the *Bula de Cruzada*, which was one of exactly the same description as that of *alcavalda*. Thus we find it was not an ecclesiastical tax,—but a civil tax paid to the king for the expenses of the state.

Our next inquiry regards its origin.

Of course we do not expect the reviewer to believe the truth of our religious doctrines, neither are we now entering upon the discussion of their truth, but we are about to state, in fact, what are some of our doctrines.

We believe that the church has power to regulate ecclesiastical discipline, and that she received this power from our Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe that a part of the discipline consists in observing days of fast and days of abstinence, and that she has authority to specify those days, and to regulate the extent of that abstinence.

We believe, of course, that she has the power of repealing those laws which she thus makes, and of modifying them, and of dispensing occasionally, when she shall see cause, with the observance of some or all of them.

We believe this dispensation may be granted by the Pope, who is the head of the church, to individuals or to collective bodies.

Upon those principles we shall explain the part regarding fasting and abstinence.

Another point of doctrine in our church, is that in giving jurisdiction to a priest to hear confessions, the bishop has it in his power to give it either fully or partially. Of course if only partial jurisdiction has been given, and the clergyman finds the person who applies for his ministry to be included in the exceptions or reservations which affect his jurisdiction, this person should apply to a priest having full powers, or, as it is usually expressed, power to absolve from all crimes and censures. But of course this does not mean that he has power to absolve from any crime, unless the penitent has dispositions which will justify him before God.

This will explain that part regarding the choice of a confessor.

We proceed to examine facts. Towards the close of the eleventh century, Peter the Hermit filled the centre of Europe with the tale of sufferings of the Christians in the East, and Pope Urban II. at the

Council of Clermont, in 1095, published the first Crusade to deliver the Greek and Asiatic Churches from the cruel persecutions, humiliations and massacres of the Mahometans. On this occasion, the remission of all canonical penances, full or plenary absolution from all ecclesiastical censures which had been incurred for previous crimes, and plenary indulgence, or the remission of all the temporal punishment due to sins which had been remitted by the mercy of God, through the merits of our Redeemer, together with a dispensation from certain fasts and abstinences, was by this Bull of the Crusade then published granted to all those who with proper dispositions, undertook an enterprise which, after solemn deliberation, had been pronounced just, necessary, and meritorious, and which appeared to be more called for by the circumstances of the times than the present state of Greece demands the sympathy and aid of modern Christians.

The Bull of the Crusade was then, in this view, a law exempting a class of persons who were looked upon as engaged in a service meritorious in the sight of God and man, useful to religion and humanity, exempting those men from the operation of a general ecclesiastical law, and extending to them certain spiritual benefits of which they were supposed capable, for reasons which were deemed sufficient. To enter upon the history of the Crusades is no part of our object, we shall not therefore pursue it. The first bull of this sort given to Spain, was by Pope Gelasius II. in 1118.

Spain had long groaned under the Moorish yoke, and her sons and her kings frequently attempted her deliverance. In the year 1128, exactly ten years after their first establishment at Jerusalem, six of the nine original knights Templars, who came to France, applied to the Council of Bishops, then sitting at Troyes, for a constitution and rules; the council acceded to their request and referred their formation to Bernard, the famous Abbot of Claraval. The rule was strict, and amongst other regulations was one of abstinence on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays, throughout the year, and fast and abstinence from milk and eggs on Fridays. They got some possessions in Spain upon condition of defending them against the Moors. About 1160 a report was current that the Arabs were bringing a great army to attack the town of Calatrava, in Castile, which was one of their commanderies. Knowing their weakness, the knights resigned the town to Sancho III., King of Castile; an abbot of Citeaux, got the place for his order upon the same conditions that the Templars had held it, and the Archbishop of Toledo, granted privileges, similar to those of the Bull of the Crusade, to such persons as would aid the abbot and his monks to keep the city.

Twenty thousand warriors assembled, the place was not attacked, the military members of the monastery had many skirmishes in which they were successful, and in 1163 Pope Alexander III. confirmed the order under the title of that of Calatrava. This was the second grant of similar dispensations to those contained in the bull, to any part of Spain.

A number of other military orders now sprung up and obtained extensive grants and privileges for preserving the country from the Mussulman ravages.

In 1210 Alphonsus IX., King of Castile, being sorely pressed by the infidels, besought the aid of the Christian princes and people, and especially of the Pope. Innocent III. exhorted the bishops of France and Provence particularly to assist him, and formally granted the dispensations of the Bull of the Crusade to those who would join his army before the Octave of Pentecost, 1211; and had prayers on his behalf offered up at Rome. He was joined by a vast number of Crusaders, and, amongst others, by the Kings of Navarre and of Arragon, and on the 16th of July he obtained one of the most signal victories on record. To go through the subsequent history of the Spanish wars is not necessary. We shall just touch upon one or two other facts very briefly.

On the eve of the feast of St. Peter, in 1236, Ferdinand, in whom the kingdoms of Leon and Castile were united, took the city of Cordova, which had been one of the strongest holds of the Moorish power, but his revenues were greatly impaired, and it was necessary to have money as well as men to protect the Christians. The exemptions of the bull had been hitherto confined to those who gave personal service in the army. The king wrote to Pope Gregory IX., requesting he would obtain pecuniary aid from the clergy. The Pope wrote to the Archbishop of Toledo, and to the bishops of Burgos and of Osma, exhorting them to make and to procure contributions from the clergy and the monasteries, and exhorting the laity to contribute, and extending to those who, in proportion to their means, would aid by contributions, the same privileges, as if they served in the field.

The long struggles with the Moors caused the same necessity for the continuation of this bull that existed for its original publication. And when, in 1483, Ferdinand and Isabella were endeavouring to regain Granada, and thus to secure the permanent safety of the Peninsula against the irruptions of the ancient enemies of their people, they found themselves greatly in want of means; the then Pope Sixtus IV. had exerted himself to procure them from the clergy and people. Innocent VIII. succeeded Sixtus in 1484, and in the next year he confirmed the act of his predecessor, so that the king prepared to attack Granada

with a considerable force. In the next year, 1486, the Grand Master of the Order of Calatrava having died, the knights prepared to go into an election; but Ferdinand and Isabella had procured from Innocent VIII. an injunction by which the administration of the order and the nomination of its grand master was given to Ferdinand during his life, and upon a memorial of the kings to the Pope, it was evident that the orders had not rendered all the services they ought, that the kings had been at very great expense, and that the only mode of recompense which was left for their service and expenditure was to be found in the receipt of the revenues of the military orders, which had not done their duty, but had been too often the cause of dissension, and of civil wars. However, it was not until the year 1500, that, under Pope Alexander VI., the grandmastership of the orders of Calatrava, and St. James of Alcantara, was finally united to the crown of Spain.

Meantime, however, Ferdinand was making progress; in 1488, after the siege of Baca, many of the principal Moors withdrew to Africa. In the next year he obtained not only the ordinary contributions, but the bishops of Avila and of Leon were commissioned to make extraordinary collections. By means of these he raised an army of 50,000 infantry and 12,000 cavalry, with which he vigorously pursued the war. In March, 1491, the Marquis of Villana went up to the enemy's country. Ferdinand and Isabella both went with the army to the conquest of this last retreat. At length a capitulation took place, and the final expulsion of the Moors was the consequence, though not immediately. Thus, in order to repay, in some measure, the expenses of a protracted warfare of upwards of six hundred years, the people were exhorted to contribute by a light tax, in proportion to their means, towards defraying the expenses; and as the contest was principally for the preservation of the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ against Mahometans, the constituted authorities of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ encouraged the faithful to contribute to the expenditures by a light tax, to be paid to that government which preserved the religion of our Saviour: and the mode of encouragement was by granting certain exemptions from the severe discipline of the church law to the contributors, and by those means repaying the government which protected religion.

One question only can be raised: Had those persons power to dispense with the observance of the law? There is no question but they had, for he who makes a law can dispense with its observance.

The reviewer, we suppose, looks upon the laws regarding fast and abstinence, and perhaps our entire discipline, as affording a gloomy

spectacle to the philanthropist or the friend of human improvement and happiness. We shall not now quarrel with him for his opinion, but we give our own, viz., that a contribution of alms, or, if he will call it so, a tax, was well bestowed to preserve Christianity where Mahometanism would have swayed, and whence it would have made its inroads upon the west of Europe, in conjunction with the ravages that it was making in the East. And we farther are of opinion that when the question was, shall we relax a part of nonessential church discipline or expose the church to destruction, there could be no doubt as to the decision. The system of loans was then unknown. But, in fact, ought not this tax properly be viewed more in the light of an interest which the posterity of the warriors and people of that day continue to pay for the preservation of the blessing which has been transmitted to them, if Christianity is a blessing? The church viewing things in this light, encourages those people to pay this tax, by granting certain privileges to the contributors.

Now that we see the origin and nature of the *Bula de Cruzada*, we ask, why was it extended to the Spanish possessions in America? The reviewer gives us the plain and obvious reason; page 206 he says the old Spaniards for many years constituted the chief part of the effective population, and willingly submitted to a government instituted in the country to which their associations and attachments were confined. He also gives us in page 166, a second reason, viz., because in 1519, which was certainly before the many years to which he alludes had passed away, the American possessions became an integral portion of Spain; and we give him a third reason, that the exemption consequent upon this tax paid for such a purpose, is in the Roman Catholic Church considered a very extraordinary favour and privilege, which Spaniards enjoy as a reward for the zeal and fidelity of their ancestors.

Now we come to examine the special provisions of this bull. For the reasons above mentioned it is not to be obtained at present in any other place but the territory of the King of Spain. If it has been continued in Mexico or Columbia, or any of the republics which have cast off the Spanish yoke, we know not. The reviewer asserts that last year the bulls were sold in Mexico. If so, it must have been by a special continuation of power upon some new ground. It certainly could not be under the ancient regulation. We are ignorant of the facts. But we know that the case has been regularly decided: 1. That any place withdrawing allegiance from the crown of Spain, loses the privilege. And 2, that upon special consideration the Pope may renew for them

the privilege without requiring, as a condition, their return to the subjection from which they had withdrawn.

The purchase of the *Bula* was a perfectly voluntary act on the part of each individual. By not purchasing he only placed himself in the situation of any other Roman Catholic out of the Spanish dominions: he committed no crime, he incurred no censure, he deprived himself of no sacrament. He kept his money in his pocket and observed the laws of the church. In this we can perceive nothing either to alarm the religious fears of the people, or to wring from them the little that remained after the torturing engine of taxation had done its heaviest work. We can also plainly perceive the error of the reviewer when he tells us, "It was deemed essential for every person to possess this bull"; for, in truth, it was essential for no person, being matter of perfect option.

We have been somewhat tedious, but the charges made upon our church were of the most destructive character, and by a respectable authority. We now say that although the writer may be of opinion that our belief is erroneous, and he may consider our whole discipline to be incorrect, yet he must feel that his article was constructed upon unsafe grounds, so far as we have examined; but what remains must be closely scrutinized. We shall defer our general remarks until after we shall have gone through with the examination and the explanation which we feel ourselves called upon to lay before our fellow-citizens.

SECTION II

In our former number we endeavoured to give some correct views of the nature of the *Bula de Cruzada*, that we may be better enabled to explain the mistakes of the Reviewer and the misrepresentations of those who furnished his materials.

We now examine his *virtues* of these *scraps of brown paper*. What then is the virtue of the scrap of brown paper? Nothing. This is an unfair mode of treating a question; neither does it manifest any wit. For when a person exhibits to you the deeds which are evidence of his right to property, when he exhibits to you his commission as an officer, or as a magistrate, or as an ambassador, it is not by the colour of the paper you are to try whether he owns the property or possesses the power. In this case, the scrap of brown paper is the evidence of having obtained a certain privilege, the ground of which we have before seen. The holder presented himself to confess to a priest who had the common approbation of the bishop, but who had not ordinarily reserved juris-

diction. The penitent could be absolved, not because he had a scrap of brown paper, but because, for what was deemed sufficient cause, this priest had in this case been vested with all jurisdiction, by the act of the Pope and the consent of the bishop.

A person going to war might fall into a crime, the jurisdiction to absolve from which was usually reserved, and he might not be able to meet a clergyman having extra-jurisdiction. The Bull of the Crusade, in this case, vested, as regarded him, every approved priest with extra-jurisdiction, and when the same privilege was extended to contributors in money, they should produce to the priest the evidence of their privilege, which evidence might be upon coarse or fine paper. The quality of the paper made no difference. Now let us see the nature of this absolution from crime by the priest: *plenam omnium suorum peccatorum* (*si de illis corde contriti, et ore confessi fuerint*) *aut non valentes confiteri id corde desideraverint indulgentiam, et remissionem*; that is, "full remission and indulgence of all their sins (if they have heartfelt contrition, and shall have made oral confession,) or not being able to confess, shall have desired it in their hearts." To the clause giving the power of selecting any approved confessor, whether his ordinary jurisdiction was limited or not, the reviewer has put an exception, "except heresy; and even of heresy he could never be suspected with this shield to protect him." We have carefully perused several copies of the bull in different languages, and not one of them that we have seen contains even the most remote allusion to any such exception. Upon what authority then was it inserted? And why was the exception really contained in the clause omitted? The following is the contained exception: *Modo in casibus in quibus necessaria erit, per ipsos, vel dato impedimento, per hæredes aut alios satisfactio fiat*: "so that in those cases in which it shall be necessary, satisfaction be made by them, or they being impeded, by their heirs or by others." Thus, the persons who had injured their neighbours in property or character, could not obtain the privileges of the bull without making the necessary satisfaction. Every Roman Catholic knows what that satisfaction is, viz., restitution. But we shall have more of that hereafter. This clause also specifies, lest it might be in any way overlooked, the absolute necessity of hearty contrition for the sins and negligences. Shall we be told that the doctrine of contrition of the heart for sin being necessary for reconciliation with heaven, is "encouraging their vices," and that they who taught it "practised on the credulity, corrupted the morals and degraded the character of the people, at the same time that they picked their pockets?" For aught we know, this might be a precious device of superstition and

crime. But we think it is a salutary doctrine, and the only foundation of sound morality.

"*On the fast days he might eat anything but meat*, and on other days he was exempted from many of the rigorous injunctions of the church." The first part of this which we have marked in *italics* is correct, and is almost the only exemption from the law of discipline, the other part is so vague, that it may be true, or not, as the word rigorous is understood. We shall now take what he calls the second bull.

The distinction here is one which is founded upon a general principle of the church, that as the clergy ought to give good example to the laity, they ought to be more rigorously observant of discipline, and ought for any necessary relaxation or indulgence to make larger sacrifices. Thus the common bull, was taken by the laity, and *Bulla parva* by the clergy. The prelates paid highest and had least relaxation of discipline, and this principle so regulated the tax and the relaxation, until it came to the laity, that the more dignified the clergyman, the more he paid, and the less relaxation be obtained. The laity took the common Bull, but viceroys and the nobility paid more than they whose income was small and who were untitled. But for all the laity the privileges were the same. Monks and nuns and friars, were not allowed any relaxations. Now the innumerable virtues may be easily summed up.

1. If any church or place should fall under interdict, these persons may use it for their devotion, provided they were not partakers in the crime which induced the interdict. They may in the territory under censure use their own private oratories for divine worship upon the same conditions, provided that on each occasion, they devoutly prayed to God to restore peace and harmony to his people and to free them from the persecutions and insults of Mahometans and other infidels. They may have Mass celebrated in those places, an hour earlier or an hour later than the canonical time. They may in those places be admitted to the sacraments, except the Easter communion; and should they die during the interdict, their obsequies may be celebrated in a moderate way.

2. The laity may on days of abstinence and fast, use all food, which would otherwise be prohibited on those days, except flesh meat. The clergy follow special and more restricted rules as above.

3. Those who shall through motives of piety, by fasting, prayer, or works of charity, or religious exercises voluntarily undertaken, endeavour to obtain from God his merciful aid for the protection of the true religion and defeat of its oppressors, having the Bull, shall receive

the remission of certain penances and the participation in the prayers and merits of other pious persons.

4. Persons of a like description, who shall on particular days unite their devout prayers with those of their brethren who offer them up for the like purpose five times before one altar, or at five different altars; shall obtain the same benefit as they who make the same stations at Rome.

5. That they may with greater purity of heart pray to God, and be more acceptably heard by him, they have power to present themselves to any approved confessor, who shall be thereby authorized upon their having the proper disposition of heart, especially true contrition for sins and negligences, and making the proper restitution to any person whom they have injured, to absolve them from all sin and censures, howsoever, and to whomsoever reserved, and after enjoining a salutary penance, to communicate to them a plenary indulgence. Once this power, and to a lesser extent at any other time through the year, and to its fullest extent at the hour of their death.

6. That their confessor shall have power, upon examination, to commute vows made by them into the performance of other good but more convenient works, except, in three cases, and except such commutation would be an act of injustice to a third person, who has not consented to the same.

Now as regards the third head. The Bull of the dead, (*Bula de Defuntos,*) we shall find it necessary to enter somewhat more at large into our explanation of one or two doctrines of our church, which the reviewer, we have no doubt, rejects as foolish and untenable. For this we shall not quarrel with him; we believe them firmly, and have no doubt whatever that God has revealed their truth; but we do not now enter upon proofs, we merely give explanations.

We believe that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained may be assisted and benefited by the suffrages of the faithful.

We believe that Christ left in his church the power of granting indulgences, and that those indulgences may be usefully applied by way of suffrage to the aid and benefit of those suffering souls.

These are doctrines of the truth of which we are firmly convinced, but as they are doctrines which in this country are greatly and generally misunderstood, we shall develope them more fully.

We believe purgatory to be a place of punishment where some souls suffer for a time before they are admitted into heaven.

We believe there is a place of eternal punishment, to which all

those souls that depart from this life in a state of mortal sin, enemies of God, will be irrevocably condemned. We call this place hell.

We believe that no sin is remitted, nor grace obtained, except through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe that those merits are efficacious, if he will, to remove the guilt of sin from the soul, and to release also from the punishment which is due to that guilt.

We believe the guilt to be different from the punishment, the guilt may be incurred several years before the infliction of the punishment: or the punishment may be inflicted immediately after the guilt is incurred; punishment follows the guilt, but is not the guilt.

We believe that punishment for the guilt of sin may be temporary as regards this life: may also be temporary in the next life, or may be eternal as regards the next world. We believe it to be eternal in hell.

We believe that when God removes the guilt of sin through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, he may remit the eternal punishment and not remit the temporary punishment.

We believe that in removing the guilt and remitting the eternal punishment, he generally inflicts a temporary punishment, the extent of which is known to him but unknown to us, which must be endured by the justified soul, unless it be removed in one of those ways which will be efficacious for its removal.

We believe that all the sins of men are mortal sins, which deserve punishment during eternity in hell.

We do believe that although in baptism and on other occasions, God does remit the guilt and all the punishment due to sin, he often, on other occasions, inflicts a temporary punishment instead of the eternal punishment which he mercifully remits.

We believe that all they who die in venial sin, and all who have not fully endured the temporary penalty affixed by God upon the remission of mortal sin, do suffer more or less in purgatory and are afterwards admitted into heaven.

We believe that all they who, justified by the merits of Christ, die without the guilt of any sin, and having no arrear of temporary punishment unremitted, are the only persons who immediately enter heaven.

We believe purgatory is not of course a permanent state.

We think the suppositions which we have made are reasonable, and that the facts which we have stated are revealed by heaven.

The communion of saints is another article of the Roman Catholic faith; by this we believe that all they who belong to the church and can be aided in their necessities, will be benefited by the prayers and good

works of persons who through the merits of Christ are acceptable to God.

We believe persons who are in a state of temporary affliction, may be aided by the suffrages, which means the prayers and good works, of acceptable supplicants offered on their behalf.

Hence we believe upon those principles and upon the testimony of revelation, that the souls in purgatory may be assisted by the suffrages of their brethren.

We come next to state our doctrine of indulgences.

An indulgence is not leave to commit sin; is not pardon of the guilt of sin; is not remission of the eternal punishment due to mortal sin: but is a total or partial remission of the canonical penance or of the temporary punishment which is due to sin after its guilt has been remitted, and which remission can be had only by the means established by God, accompanied with the dispositions required by God.

We believe this power of indulgences was left by Christ in his church.

We believe it consists in the authorized minister of the God of heaven in his church, granting by the authority of God an application of the superabundant means of reconciliation left by the ordinance of Christ, to the obtaining from God partial or total remission of temporary punishment to certain persons, for sufficient reasons.

We believe this application cannot be arbitrarily and wantonly made, and if so made it is inefficacious.

We believe that it must be made for good and sufficient cause, profitable to religion and the improvement of morals, and if not so made, it is inefficacious.

We believe that no application of indulgence can be profitably made to a person who is not in the state of friendship with God, and truly serving him in spirit and in truth, and if any benefit is expected from the use of an indulgence by a person in the state of mortal sin, or disposed to commit mortal sin, such expectation is a foolish delusion.

We believe that besides being in the friendship of God, a person in order to profit by an indulgence, must faithfully perform the required duties.

Thus we believe, that no ecclesiastical authority can grant an indulgence for mere temporal purposes, and any whose object would tend to such purposes and end in them would be altogether useless and invalid.

But we believe that the contribution of alms for a purpose bene-

ficial to religion, is not for a mere temporal means; as to raise an army to protect Christian nations from the destruction of infidels.

We also believe, that be the contribution ever so great in money, the contributor will not receive any benefit of the indulgence unless he first becomes reconciled to God by the means which God prescribes, and fully and sincerely determines to lead a virtuous life.

Now the *Bula de Cruzada* expresses all this in a manner which, to Roman Catholics, is fully clear and much more forcibly conveyed than it is here by us. Hence, if the traffic in these bits of brown paper be a scandalous imposition, the means of detecting the imposition are afforded to the purchasers, because they have in print the conditions, which to them are fully intelligible. To one who is not a Roman Catholic, and who is too proud of his ignorance respecting tenets which he condemns without inquiry, in the technical expressions and in the phrases there might be some obscurity, which he ought to attribute to his own self-sufficiency in not caring to inquire; and should he write about what he has never sought to know, can we be astonished at the exhibition of blunders which he would, perhaps, glory for not having taken pains to prevent?

Now, the writer of the *Review* did not understand our doctrine, and yet he has most majestically condemned what he did not take the trouble to study. We prefer this to the other side of the alternative; for if he did know our doctrine, we should be reluctantly compelled to think most unfavourably of his moral feelings. We should consider him to be a deliberate and wanton libeller of the largest Christian body in the universe.

The bull says: They who contribute to repay the Kings of Spain for the heavy losses and expenses incurred in preserving Christianity against the Mussulmans, shall be exempt from some of the rigorous discipline of the church; and those of them who do besides, with true sorrow of heart for sin, endeavour to obtain pardon for those sins, through the sacraments of our Lord Jesus Christ, received with proper dispositions, making satisfaction to their injured neighbours, shall receive an indulgence; and those of them who by prayers and good works, will endeavour to render God propitious to his church, shall also receive an indulgence. No one is obliged to contribute, but this encouragement is held forth to the contributors.

The reviewer says: It is deemed essential for every person to possess the bull. This precious device of superstition and of crime was employed by alarming the religious fears of the people on one hand, and encouraging their vices on the other, to wring from them the little

that remained after the torturing engine of taxation had done its heaviest work; this tax corrupted the morals of the people at the same time that it picked their pockets.

Now we would humbly ask how an optional contribution can be called a tax? How that which might be conscientiously omitted could be deemed essential? How the religious fears of the people were alarmed by leaving them an unbiased choice? How money was wrung from them which they were not placed under any necessity of paying? How pockets were picked in the case before us? How this custom which made true repentance of the heart the first requisite could be an encouragement of vice? How reconciliation to Heaven and satisfaction to the injured neighbour could be a device of crime and superstition?

We do, with all due humility, suggest to the editor of the *Review*, that the people of this Union are not now to be misled by words; that the mind of America looks for facts; and that, so far as our religion is concerned, mere school declamation, and rounded periods, and degrading epithets of abuse prettily strung together, will not serve for information. The mind that in South America conceived and carried through the mighty work of its useful revolution, is not so peurile as to permit superstition and crime to domineer over a land which it has emancipated. Nor is the mind which is awake and healthfully energetic, and now putting forth its vigour in this favoured land, so sunk in the prejudices of Great Britain, as to be led by a cry of No Popery, and to believe that everything which was described as horrible and supertitious, is such in fact, merely because the Pilgrims said so.

We will give the Reviewer leave to designate all our creed folly, and all our discipline superstition, if he will, but we assure him that he is grossly in error if he believes that creed or that discipline encourage vice or engender crimes. Upon close examination, he will find both theory and fact against his imagination.

We believe the suffrages of the living are beneficial to the dead who are in need of them and capable of being relieved. We do not believe the saints in heaven need those suffrages. We do not believe the reprobate in hell is capable of relief. We believe the souls in purgatory do need our aid, and may be assisted. But though we know this general doctrine, we cannot know the fact that a particular individual is in purgatory, nor what special quantity of prayer or other suffrage would be adequate to full relief. It is true that God does know, and may inform us if he will, but he has not done so, and we are not in every case to expect a special revelation of the fact. Such a revelation would be an extraordinary interference. The church teaches the general doctrine;

the church does not know the special fact; no individual or body in the church can tell who is in purgatory, nor what suffrages would be adequate to release one sufferer therefrom. A dark curtain divides us from the world of spirits. Our mighty Father could shoot the beam of knowledge through the immense mass of clouds, if he would; but he does not. His voice has penetrated through the chaos, and by the words of revelation he has taught us the general doctrine, he has exhorted us to the charity of aiding those who suffer, and taught us that our prayer will avail, but he has not informed us to what extent. We then, with eyes suffused with tears, yet lifted in hope, and hands stretched out in supplication, offer for our departed friends the suffrages of our prayers, of our works, of our piety, and through the merits of Christ we beseech for them a speedy release from the house of bondage. The *Bula de Defuntos*, is a suffrage of this sort, applicable to the aid of those capable of being assisted, but giving no certainty of release.

The reviewer will probably smile at our superstitious infatuation in praying for the dead. We look upon it to be an injunction of Heaven, and we do not envy him the coldness, the barrenness, the desolation of his mock philosophy, whilst we indulge, under the sanction of God's revelation, the holiest propensity of our nature, by which the charities of religion and the feelings of warm affection are made to survive within us, and even after their object has faded to our view, after the worm has consumed all that was mortal of our friends, we still commune in the language of spirits, and feel how strongly the bonds of religion can unite those whom the desolations of nature have severed.

But the reveiwer is grossly incorrect, when he affirms that this bull was indispensable to rescue the departed souls from purgatory; it is not indispensable, and it could not be obtained except in the Spanish dominions; so that if his proposition was true, no one but a Spaniard could ever be rescued from purgatory.

The poor people whom he describes in mock commiseration, knew well that this was no passport, though their affection and their piety might have made them anxious to obtain every species of relief.

SECTION III

We now come to the most serious part of the charge against our religion and the gross portion of the libel. We shall insert the fact charged upon us.

Extract from page 187.

"4. The Bull of Composition which released persons who had stolen goods, from

the obligation to restore them to the owner. One slight condition, it is true, was attached to this bull, which was, that the person, when stealing, had not been moved thereto by any forethought of the virtue of a bull to make the property his own, and his conscience white. Bating this small condition, the bull converted all stolen goods into the true and lawful property of the thief. It had the power, moreover, to correct the moral offences of false weights, and measures, tricks and fraud in trade, and, in short, all these little obliquities of principles and conduct to which swindlers resort to rob honest people of their possessions. 'It assures thè purchaser,' says Depons, 'the absolute property in whatever he may obtain by modes that ought to have conducted him to the gallows.' The price of these bulls depended on the amount of goods stolen; but it is just to add, that only fifty of them could be taken by the same person in the year.''

We never read a more unfounded and libellous paragraph than the above. It distinctly exhibits the Roman Catholic Church as entering into partnership with thieves and robbers, and undertaking, for a share of the plunder, to whiten their consciences. When the reader shall have seen the true state of things, let him judge for himself. We must again lay down our principles before we can explain the facts.

We believe that the church has no power to deprive any man of his property; for when our Lord established the church, the authority which he gave was not temporal, but spiritual.

We believe that no man has power to remit to another a debt which he owes, unless the debt be owing to him who remits it. Composition being a species of remission, we of course do not believe the church has any power to make a composition with a debtor, and remit to him what he owes to another who is his creditor, or who has been injured by him, for this would be to exercise over property a dominion which God has never bestowed upon the church.

We believe that no man who has injured his neighbour in his property or character, can be truly contrite for his sin so committed, unless he has the disposition to make all the due satisfaction in his power, to the injured neighbour.

We believe that without this contrition and satisfaction, the sin will not be remitted by God.

The bull, as we stated in our last number, in that part regarding the remission of crimes and penalties, had this expres scondition: *Modo in casibus in quibus necessaria erit, per ipsos, vel dato impedimento, per hoeredes aut alios satisfactio fiat.* ''Provided, that in those cases where it shall be necessary, satisfaction be made by them, or they not being able, by their heirs or by others.'' This is a principle which nothing can subvert; until the last farthing shall be paid, there is no escaping from the judgments of God.

What is the difference of practice between a Protestant and a Cath-

olic on this head, for there is no difference of principle? It is more strict on the side of the Catholic. We put a case for elucidation. A Catholic and a Protestant have been both unjust; each repents. The Protestant feels that he ought to repair the injury; he makes his own estimate, we will admit conscientiously; he restores and prays to God for pardon, determining not to be again unjust. The Catholic repents and goes to confession, he informs a priest who is answerable at the risk of his own soul to decide to the best of his knowledge upon every case. The penitent is examined, the circumstances are weighed, the consequences inquired into. The decision is made by one not interested in diminishing the amount to be restored, by one who is answerable to the tribunal of God for any injustice which he may sanction, by one who has studied morality, and especially the principles of justice and contracts, in order to be able fairly to decide those cases, and to destroy the illusions of self-love in his penitents, to answer the sophistry which the love of money will dictate, and to speak the words of divine justice to the transgressor: after having been advised thus, and having repented and restored, the Catholic seeks pardon from God.

We unhesitatingly assert, there is less danger of the Catholic who confesses not making proper satisfaction, than of his being deluded and deceived.

But will not the Bull of Composition enable his confessor to go in shares with him, and whiten his conscience? No! Payment to his confessor is not restitution. Giving money to his confessor is no satisfaction for his injustice; neither does he give money to his confessor. We have known much of confession, but we never yet knew of money being paid for it, nor on account of it. But we have known money given to the confessor to be by him paid to the injured party, lest the penitent should be discovered; for a man may repent and make restitution, but is not bound to expose himself; and we have in those cases known the confessor, as he ought to do, procure the receipt of the persons to whom the money was given, which receipt he gave to his penitent to prove that he fulfilled his duty and discharged his trust. A Catholic finding money given by a penitent to a confessor, knows why it is given; the same act may wear to Protestants a different aspect; most of their prejudices arise from such imperfect judgments.

What then is the Bull of Composition? We must state a few more principles before we can explain.

Sometimes a man has injured his neighbour, and he cannot discover whether the injured person is gone, nor where his children may be found,

but the property which he has unjustly obtained is not therefore transferred to him.

Sometimes the property to be restored to individuals is but of small amount to each, and the persons to whom restitution should be made are at a great distance, not greatly in need, and not expected to return, and there is no mode of communicating with them, or of transmitting it to them; yet the dishonest possessor cannot retain it.

Sometimes the injured person has died leaving no heirs, to whom restitution could be made, yet the possessor cannot retain property which he has unjustly acquired.

A variety of cases of this description come repeatedly under the view of the clergymen who hear confessions in our church. The principles of justice are plain, evident, unchangeable.—1. *Suum cuique tributo*—"Give to every one what belongs to him." 2. *Res clamat domino*—"The property seeks for the master." 3. *Fraus sua nemini patrocinari debet*—"No person should be a gainer by his dishonesty." 4. *Res fructificat domino*—"Property increases for its owner." 5. *Alteri ne feceris quod tibi non fieri vis*—"Do not unto others as you would not wish them to do unto you." Now upon those maxims the confessor cannot admit the penitent to the sacraments until after full restitution shall have been made to the injured person, if the said person can by any reasonable exertion be discovered, and if the penitent can in any way, by any fair exertion make it, or being unable now to do so, will enjoin his heirs or other friends upon whom he may have a claim, to do so. There is no useful receiving of the sacrament without this, and without the useful receiving of the sacrament, none of these benefits of this bull can be obtained. Thus, where the injured person is known and restitution can be made, it is absolutely and indispensably necessary to make it to himself, or to secure it to him. Can we then be blamed at feeling warmly and perhaps almost indignantly at finding the church to which we have the happiness to belong, and which has always been guided by those principles, traduced and vilified, and abused and misrepresented to the American people in such a work as the *North American Review?*

Then is there no composition? Yes, but a very different kind from that which has been stated. Take our first supposition; a man who feels that he has been unjust confesses it. The priest tells him to restore the amount to the owner. The penitent answers that he cannot discover where the owner now is, nor whither he has gone, nor can he find any of his connexions. The amount of the injustice is ascertained, and the penitent is told to purchase as many bulls as will cover the sum, and hav-

ing done so, he exhibits them to the confessor as evidence of his having made the payment. This is called composition. And these are called the Bulls of Composition. Now there are here several indispensable conditions.—1. The penitent must make oath that he has used all diligence to find the injured party or his heirs, and has not been able to discover them nor any of them. 2. The penitent is distinctly informed that if injustice was committed with any view to making the restitution by this composition, it will not release his conscience, because this would be affording room for a malicious disposition to injure a person who ought to be protected, and quieting the conscience of the criminals by paying to the treasury a sum of money of which he defrauded another. This would enable him to gratify his revenge or malice, and produce many other evils. 3. It is restricted to the amount of the price of fifty of those bulls, because it is supposed that although small debts may be overlooked, or small creditors not be found, still the presumption is, that persons to whom large sums are due could be discovered; and if they cannot, special reference to a higher tribunal than ordinary, must be had, for making particular investigation, and special composition. 4. Should the injured person be found after this composition, and the unjust person find that his composition was not fully made, he is in conscience bound to restore the balance to the injured party. And if the creditor can show that the debtor could have found him by using greater diligence, he can compel him to pay the entire to himself. We apprehend that when all those conditions are fulfilled, the bull is found to have very little efficacy in converting the stolen goods in the true and lawful property of the thief.

Now as to the power of correcting the moral offences of false weights, and so forth. The penitent examined before God, how much he had gained by his fraud; the confessor having ascertained the amount, told him that, as he injured a community, he must make general restitution, then told him how many bulls to purchase, he bought them, was exhorted to repent, and to ask pardon of God, to have recourse to the means established by Christ for forgiveness, to be honest in future and thus dismissed with his "moral offences corrected," a heart changed, and very little profit of his crimes.

We have not the honour of knowing Mr. Depons: but we unhesitatingly aver that we can have no respect for the authority of a man, who with those facts under his eye, could write that the bull of composition "assures to the purchaser, the absolute property, in whatever he may acquire by modes, that ought to have conducted him to the gallows."

There are two other cases, in which the bull of composition might

be taken. The first, where a clergyman received the income of his place for the performance of spiritual duties, which he neglected to fulfil, or which he fulfilled badly, imperfectly. In this case he was evidently bound to restore the goods for which he did not make the proper return. He could not take bulls to more than half the amount, the other half he should return to the fund of the particular church. This was a special case, and is an exception; for upon the general principle he would be bound to return the entire to the injured church, as he knew the defrauded owner, and could reach it, but as the fund created by the bulls, was intended for the good of religion, the church to which the restitution ought to be made consented, by her chief pastor, to bestow half the proceeds of such restitution to the Crusade treasury.

Another case of exception regards legacies left by the way of restitution for goods badly acquired. The Spanish and civil law, both required certain formalities to be gone through within a year from notice received in such cases by the legatees; and if they neglected within the year to go through the form, the heirs of the deceased were authorized to pay half the amount to the treasury of the Crusade, by taking bulls or other evidence of the payment, and the bull declared that having thus honestly complied with the provisions of the law, they were in conscience exonerated. But this did not extend to any other species of legacy, nor to any other debt.

Having taken this view of the nature of the Bull of Composition, our readers will be better enabled to judge of the true meaning of the following extract:

Ut possit Commissarius componere super illicite habitis; necnon super medietate legatorum omnium, quæ propter male ablata facta sunt, si legatarii per annum in exactione negligentes fuerint; et super illis quæ facta erunt et quæ dicto anno durante fient, si legatarii inveniri non potuerunt; necnon super male ablatis, et per usurariam pravitatem, aut aliter male acquisitis, si in omnibus præmissis casibus, (præterquam annualis dictæ negligentiæ,) personæ, quibus restitutio seu solutio facienda est (præstito per restitutorem juramento de diligentia per cum facta pro inveniendo legatorio seu creditore, et minime invento) non reperiantur, possit commissarius componere, et illos debitores liberare.

"That the commissary shall have power to make composition for property unjustly held, also for the moiety of all legacies which are made for things unlawfully taken, if the legatees shall, during a year, have been negligent in making their claims, and for legacies which shall have been found made, or which may be made during the aforesaid year, if the legatees cannot be discovered; also for property unjustly taken,

or acquired by usurious wickedness or otherwise badly, if, however, in all those cases (except those of the aforesaid year's neglect), the persons to whom the restitution or payment should be made, cannot be found, (the restorer having made oath that he had used diligence to find the legatees or the creditor, and could by no means find them.'')

Now, in the name of common justice, in the name of religion, in the name of truth and of honour, we ask the reviewer whether this is entering into partnership with thieves and plunderers, to whiten their consciences, for a share of the plunder?

But why give the money to the Crusade fund? We shall answer, but first we must explain.

It is now clear that it is a principle of our moralists, as it is of common justice, that no person who unjustly retains what belongs to his neighbour can obtain forgiveness from God, unless he shall have made restitution. When the owner is known, it cannot be given to any other person except by his express authority. If a man holds ten dollars belonging to his neighbour, whom he knows, and subscribes one hundred and ten dollars towards building a church, or for any other good purpose, meaning to give one hundred as his donation, and to pay the ten on behalf of his injured neighbour, he is not thereby exonerated from the debt to that neighbour; because payment to the church is not payment to him; he not only still owes the ten dollars, but is, moreover, answerable for all the bad consequences of his unjust retaining of that money; let him build a hundred churches and hospitals, and take fifty bulls of crusades, these ten dollars still remain due; and if the injured person for want of ten dollars, is cast into prison, or loses the fair opportunity of making a good purchase, the church-builder and bull-buyer, is answerable before God for all the consequences. Nothing can weaken the force of this immutable principle of right. The duty of the debtor is to pay his creditor; the right of the creditor is to build churches or buy bulls, or fling his money into the fire, as he pleases. The man who assumes to be liberal, or charitable, or pious, with money which does not belong to him, is a rogue—generally the worst kind of rogue, a hypocrite.

But another principle of justice is equally clear: when you are bound to restore, but cannot find your creditor, this accident does not give you a right to the fruit of your dishonesty. The property is not yours. How is it to be disposed of? In that way which it is reasonably supposed would be most agreeable to the creditor. Give to his children, or to his relations, or to those whom he used to aid and serve: you cannot find any of those; you have used proper though unavailing diligence.

Then follow his presumed will: give it to that useful public institution which you believe he would himself prefer: give it to the poor, and the alms will, before God, be received on his account. But if any nation has made a public regulation upon the subject, you are to follow the decision of the law, in preference to your own private judgment. Spain has made this public regulation; and upon that ground, the principle in Spain is, "when you have injured your neighbor, repent, and restore to him his property: if you cannot find him, pay it to the treasury of the nation, through the commissary of the *Bula de Cruzada.*" The principle in Spain is, "your self-love and your avarice are likely to delude you in estimating the amount that you should restore. Go tell your case to a clergyman who has nothing to gain or to lose, and who must therefore be impartial, who is answerable to God for the decision, and therefore likely to be conscientious, who has studied the principles of justice, and after examination, been admitted to his place, and is therefore likely to be correct. Be guided by him: if you have reason to doubt the correctness of his judgment, go to another, or go to his superior, and remember the admonition, 'what will it profit a man to gain the whole world and to lose his own soul?' "

It may, perhaps, be the effect of prejudice or of partiality in us, but we have always thought this discipline of our church was better calculated to promote the interests of society and of religion, better fitted to protect the property of individuals, and the morality of the public, than the mere general preaching of the same principles, without the special application of them to individual cases, as practised in our church.

The only difference between the Spanish dominions and other portions of the Catholic world, on this subject, is, that in Spain and its dependencies, the precise mode of making this sort of restoration, is pointed out: in other places, the person bound to make the restoration, has greater room for choice as to what object the money shall be applied; there is no choice as regards the immutable principles of justice.

We have now given to the people of America, the true statement of facts, and the correct exhibition of principles, the misrepresentations of both of which formed the groundwork of the flippant abuse and unmeasured language of the reviewer. Let him now look to his own phraseology and say was it deserved, if our statement is correct. For the correctness of that statement, we are ready to stand amenable to the tribunal of the candour and investigation of this world, and we stake the salvation of our souls in the next. Our asseveration is a solemn appeal to heaven: for we have been most cruelly ill treated. Our religion has been accused by those who did not know it, with plundering the people

by infamous juggling artifice, to stir up their passions, and interests; and even to quicken their crimes, when this could be done with a better prospect of grasping their money. It was accused of "forming a league with the powers of darkness." It was accused "of mocking religion." It was accused "of outraging justice." It was accused "of keeping sixteen millions of people in a barbarous and debasing thraldom." Bear with us, fellow-citizens, for awhile. This charge has been ushered forth under the auspices of your most conspicuous literary chieftain. Are we guilty? Read the proofs against us; read our answer. Too long have you formed your judgments of us upon the exclusive testimony, shall we call it? no! vituperation of our opponents. Hear us; examine us. But before you vilify, listen and reflect. We have much to add.

SECTION IV

We now come to a new division of the article, which is more vague in its construction, though not less virulent in its temper. We know not whether we should attribute its very serious errors to the ignorance of the reviewer, or to the dishonesty of his informants; we must suppose the latter, and when we even suspect ignorance it is not of that description which amongst some persons is degrading or unfashionable, therefore we do not use the word in its offensive meaning. Were a man who knew nothing of geography, to write upon that branch of knowledge, it would be very wrong; so it would be improper for a person who knew nothing of law to give us a treatise upon the practice of courts, and for a man who never studied surgery or medicine, to publish his notions upon anatomy and materia medica. But it is quite otherwise as regards the Roman Catholic religion; a person needs no other qualification to write against it, than to be so disposed, and the abundance of the spirit becomes manifest in the vehemence of the phraseology. No zeal can be too ardent, no expression too strong, no vituperation too severe; little attention need be paid to facts, circumstances need not be examined, nor is it always necessary to have regard to even probability itself. Your Bible, and the influence of the spirit, and the craving appetite of your readers, pen, ink, paper and a printer—all that is required is ready. We regret not so much for our own sake, as for the sake of history and truth, that from a long-established habit of permitting every species of abuse against our creed to pass uncontradicted, gross ignorance of facts has been substituted for correct information, nor can we conceal our own feelings:

——— *doluere cruento*
Dente lacessiti:

Would to God, we could with equal truth, follow up the rest of the sentence. However, such a time may yet arrive. But to our examination. After disposing of the bulls of which he knew so little, the reviewer proceeds to the next topic:

Extract from Pages 188, 189, 190.

"IV. The ecclesiastical hierarchy in South America was one of peculiar construction; for although it acknowledged nominal submission to the Pope, it was in reality independent of him, and subject only to the King of Spain, as its supreme head. This power was unwittingly put out of the hands of the papal see, by the famous bull of Pope Alexander the Sixth to Ferdinand and Isabella, in the year 1593, in which his holiness was so obliging as to divide the world in twain by a line drawn through a certain point from pole to pole, [*una linea desde el polo artico al polo antartico,*] and bestow on these Spanish sovereigns and their successors for ever all right, title, and dominion over the countries at that time discovered, or which at any future period should be discovered, beyond the said line. This piece of kindness in the Pope was taken in its fullest latitude, and, by the liberal construction of the kings of Spain, it made their jurisdiction absolute in civil, political, and ecclesiastical concerns. This jurisdiction, granted as they say, *por bulas de los sumos pontifices de su proprio motu,* they have always retained and exercised, notwithstanding some ineffectual endeavours on the part of the see of Rome to recover the ecclesiastical power. In truth, the Popes never had any authority in South America, nor could they communicate directly with the bishops, except in a few unimportant cases.

"Everything emanated from the king. Even the Pope's bulls and dispensations were obliged first to be transmitted to the Council of the Indies, and sanctioned by that body before they could be sent to America. In the appointment of archbishops and bishops, the Pope enjoyed the empty privilege of nomination, but the appointments were made from the highest to the lowest offices by the king. All the ecclesiastical revenues went to him; nor could a cathedral, or even a village church be erected, without his special license.[65] This patronage was of immense importance; it enabled the crown to concert every measure in the best possible way for controlling the people, and bending them to the great purpose always in view, that of draining gold and silver from the Indies. The salaries of the bishops depended on tithes, and were therefore fluctuating. The average salary of the Bishop of Havana, was eighty thousand dollars; that of the Archbishop of La Plata, at Charcas, sixty-five thousand; and the Bishop of Caracas some years received seventy thousand. In Mexico, Peru, and Chili, the church was very rich, and the poorest bishoprics in the country yielded from five thousand to twenty thousand dollars a year.[66] The host of inferior clergy was innumerable, and for the most part every ecclesiastic was liberally paid. The king received the first year's salary of all the officers in the church.

[65] The law on this subject is very pointed: *Mandamos, que no se erija, instituya, funde ni constituya iglesia catedral ni parroquial, monasterio, hospital, iglesia votiva, ni otro lugar pio ni religioso sin licencia expressa nuestra.—Recop.* Lib. i, Tit. vi. Ley. 2.

[66] Walton's *Spanish Colonies,* vol. ii. p. 4, Pazos says, that three bishops in Peru, and four in Rio de La Plata, including the archbishop, each received an annual income varying from 40 to 60,000 dollars.—*Letters,* p. 84.

"The ecclesiastical tribunals had a wide jurisdiction, reaching to all concerns of a spiritual nature, to the regulation of the monasteries and priests, donations and legacies to the church, tithes, marriages, and the like. The Inquisition was also established in South America, with nearly the same powers and privileges as in Spain. As heresy was not among the besetting sins of the South American colonists, this body seems to have had little to do in pursuing those who had erred *in delictis contra fidem*, the object for which it was originally professed to be instituted. So potent a council could not be idle, however, and it sought importance chiefly by the vigilance with which it guarded against the inroads of knowledge, and the zeal with which it drew closer and closer the veil of ignorance over the minds of the people. To this topic we shall revert in another place."

Now the reviewer has fallen into three mistakes in the first four lines. For first, the ecclesiastical hierarchy in South America was not one of peculiar construction. It was of the same construction as that of Old Spain; in fact, its construction was the same as that of every other portion of the Roman Catholic church. It had a patriarch, archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, and so forth. It could not have a peculiar construction as a portion of the universal church, and in truth it had not. It acknowledged not only nominally, but really submission to the Pope, and it was not in reality independent of him. The Pope had as much jurisdiction in South America, as he had in Spain, in France, in Portugal. It was not subject to the King of Spain only, or in any manner, as its supreme head. This article then commences with three very serious mistakes, for which we do not blame the reviewer; he fell into them from want of being acquainted with the doctrine and discipline of our church. He had before him facts which he did not understand. In this respect he is not singular. Some of our most learned and respected friends, amiable, good men, whose talents are far beyond our pretensions, and whose general knowledge is much more extensive than we can ever hope to acquire, and who have travelled in Catholic countries, have frequently given to us lessons which have greatly corrected our pride, when we heard them declaiming in blunders upon what was not worth their serious attention, but had been the subject of our deep research and long study. Though we must bow with deference to the literary dictation of the editor of the *North American Review*, yet as we wish him to be perfect in everything, if he would not be angry at the impudence of our suggestion, we would humbly offer to teach him Catholic Theology and Church History, not for the purpose of making him embrace "a system which raises such a torrent of iniquity, that wise and virtuous bishops, armed with all the authority of the church cannot check, nor turn it aside"—but that he may write upon those subjects in such a manner as not to excite the smile of those who have

studied, and the indignation of those who know what the Roman Catholic religion is.

We can leave to others to carp at the slight anachronism of making Alexander VI., who died in 1503, give a bull ninety years afterwards, 1593, to Ferdinand, who died in 1516, and Isabella, who died in 1504; as we prefer throwing the fault upon the compositor, who ought to have given the true date of the document, 1492, to suspecting that the reviewer could by any possibility be ignorant.

We shall only undertake to give such an explanation as satisfies our own minds, and may, perhaps, satisfy our readers, that although Ferdinand and Isabella did not want the Pope's bull to enable them to occupy America, yet that there were some circumstances which then existed and are not often told by historians or writers of a particular description, which throw much light upon the subject, and next that this bull did not make the King of Spain supreme head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in South America.

The naval character of England had not yet been created in the decline of the fifteenth century. The Italians had considerably neglected their maritime affairs, or confined themselves within the Straits of Gibraltar; but the Portuguese had already penetrated to India by the Cape of Good Hope; they had made several settlements upon the coast of Africa, and discovered the Madeira and Cape de Verd Islands. The Spaniards had been embroiled with their Portuguese neighbours,—and when, in 1472, Cardinal Borgia, afterwards Alexander VI., was sent by Sixtus IV. as legate to Spain, he did much to reconcile their conflicting interests. Columbus having offered his services to Portugal, upon their rejection by Genoa, and finding the unfair advantage which had been taken of his charts and documents, requested employment from Spain; and in 1492, having obtained his commission through the exertions of Isabella, before Rome was consulted, the king, Ferdinand, had granted him his authority. But a probability of disputes arising between the Spaniards and Portuguese was foreseen; and as one of the professed objects of the courts was the conversion of infidel nations to the Christian faith, in the avowal of which we believe Isabella was sincere, it became necessary to obtain from the chief pastor of Christendom, the proper jurisdiction; hence application was made to Alexander, who was then Pope. Few who sat upon the Papal chair have disgraced it: but, amongst those few, Alexander VI. is shamefully conspicuous. In this bull he not only gave the crown of Spain the exclusive power to send duly authorized clergymen into those countries which should be discovered, to the westward of a meridian, one hundred leagues west of

the Azores,—but the words have been also construed to mean assumption on his part, of a right to confer the temporal dominion of those new discoveries. However, we are of opinion that the correct view of this Papal act was, drawing a line of demarcation, and giving, by virtue of his apostolical authority, power to the crown of Spain to send missionaries to all newly discovered lands to the west of that line,—and to the Portuguese to send missionaries to all newly discovered lands to the east thereof, so that no conflict should arise between those two naval powers, then the only ones employed in pursuing discoveries. Thus, although we do not acknowledge in the See of Rome any power to grant temporal dominion, we do acknowledge its exclusive right to exercise and to confer spiritual jurisdiction in all places which are destitute of lawful pastors,—and of this description, are, of course, all newly discovered lands. We, moreover, do think that no plan could be more wise or better calculated to preserve peace between two scarcely reconciled naval powers employed in making discoveries, probably for their own aggrandizement, though under the pretext of religion, than to confine their religious jurisdiction in such a way as to prevent their collision.

Now, if these bulls gave merely the temporal rights over the newly discovered nations to the Spanish crown, as writers generally assert, we could at once, upon this ground, tell the reviewer that it did not follow, from the grant of temporal dominion, that the crown of Spain received spiritual authority,—and in this supposition the reviewer's premises would not contain his conclusion. If he says the grant was both of temporal and spiritual power, it will not make the case stronger than we make it by confining it to what is improperly called spiritual, but properly ecclesiastical. Confining the grant to this, Alexander VI. bestowed no more than he could and might have given, viz., a delegation of his own power to a certain extent.

Thus, it is clear, that if the crown of Spain claimed by virtue of the bull, it acknowledged the right to grant in him who gave that document. The grant was but the delegation of a power; no person can make a power of delegation, unless he has the original power in himself, nor can the delegate, upon general principles and common right, withstand the revocation of that power,—though he may, upon special contract, or, which is the same thing, special law. The reviewer is, therefore, totally wrong in principle, when he contends that, by virtue of this bull, the power of the Pope over the ecclesiastical hierarchy of South America was unwittingly put away from the Papal See.

He not only is incorrect in principle, but he is incorrect in fact,—for there was no hierarchy more attached to the Papal See, more ob-

servant of its ordinances; and one of the most common topics of reproach against the South American clergy, by writers of the same stamp as the reviewer, has been, for two centuries, their abject servility to the Pope.

What has been the cause of his mistake? Are not the facts correctly given? Some are, others are not. In those which are correctly given, he makes very serious mistakes respecting their bearings. We would ask him, in place of the following vague expression, "This jurisdiction granted, as they say, *por bulas de los sumos pontifices de su proprio motu*, they (the Kings of Spain) have always retained and exercised, notwithstanding some ineffectual endeavours on the part of the See of Rome to recover the ecclesiastical power,"—to give us a few facts, names, times, circumstances. This is the mode of testing truth. We are sick of this unmeaning verbiage which is deceptive; for it leads the unthinking to believe that so great a man, so wise a man, so learned a man, so liberal a man as the editor of the *North American Review*, would not make assertions without facts. O that he would condescend to favour us with a few, and thus give us the opportunity of testing the truth! "The Popes never had any authority in South America." We say they always had. Every archbishop, every bishop, every church dignitary, swore to support that authority, obeyed that authority, and swore that it was of divine institution. Find us one archbishop, bishop, or dean entering upon his office by any other authority, and we yield to you the palm.

The reviewer either does not know his subject, or he wilfully endeavours to deceive his readers. We are by no means disposed to believe him to be a dishonest man. He probably could not learn the nature of the doctrine and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church in the New England Colleges,—and we cannot, therefore, wonder that he makes the mistakes which crowd upon his pages.

We shall explain a small portion of our canon law, and thus help him to a solution.

A benefice is an act of benevolence performed by one person in favour of another. This act may be a gratutious donation, or a favour conferred for some service already done, or to be done at a future period. It is plain, the donor may, upon making his gift, accompany the benefice by requiring any condition which he may think proper. It rests with the person to whom it is offered to receive the gift upon the stipulated condition, or to decline the acceptance. A corporation may receive such a gift upon condition that some one or more of its members shall perform certain duties. The church at large is a spiritual corporation. She has made several laws regulating what conditions may, without injury

to religion, be affixed to her benefices. She has also appointed which of her public officers shall have authority to enter into those special agreements, and how far their powers shall extend.

An ecclesiastical benefice is, then, some permanent advantage enjoyed by an ecclesiastic, in consideration of a certain spiritual duty to be done by him. One of the usual stipulations of the persons who create an ecclesiastical benefice fully sufficient for the respectable support of one ecclesiastic, is for the enjoyment of the right of patronage. The right of patronage arises only where the benefice is of a permanent nature, such as land, public funds, and so forth, the property of which is conveyed fully and irrevocably from the donor to the church, and the dominion of which is thus vested in the church,—the use being in the incumbent, who is also during his incumbency the trustee who, in the name of the church, exercises the dominion necessary for the preservation and defence of the property, but who has no dominion of conveyance in himself. The right of patronage consists in the privilege which the donor, and after him his heirs, possess of keeping, during a short time, this place open after the death or removal of the incumbent, so as to give to the donor an opportunity of presenting some one of his own choice, who is fully qualified for the discharge of the duties of the benefice to the superior, who has power to give him the necessary jurisdiction for their discharge. The superior is bound to give a preference over all others equally qualified, to the candidate presented by the patron. The spiritual superior is the sole judge of those qualifications, and the only source of jurisdiction. The offering a candidate as the one to be preferred, is called presentation. The subsequent giving jurisdiction is called investiture. The right of presentation is in the patron, the right of investiture is in the spiritual superior. The presentation gives no power, the investiture only gives the jurisdiction.

When the person presented is inducted or invested, he is the incumbent; he may exercise the power by virtue of the commission of the spiritual superior, and he enjoys the benefice through the liberality of the patron. But should he commit a fault, or neglect his duty, the right of visitation and inquiry is only in the spiritual superior; the patron cannot interfere, he cannot prevent the visitation, he cannot protect the delinquent. Neither can he remove the incumbent, nor sit upon his trial, nor withhold the income; for before he could obtain the right of patronage, he was obliged to relinquish the dominion and the management of the property; the incumbent is amenable only to his spiritual superior, and the only right of the patron, the right of presentation, will revert only upon the vacancy.

Thus, the King of Spain having endowed all the bishopries and archbishopries of South America, enjoyed the right of presentation. The Pope was the spiritual superior; he had his power of confirmation or rejection; by his letters apostolic he gave investiture, and so forth. Hence the patronage of the Kings of Spain did not divest the Pope of his power,—and the reviewer would never have written as he did, if he had the slightest knowledge of the subject; but we do not blame him for his want of opportunity. The same principle explains the case of the minor benefices. The king was patron, the bishop was the superior.

We now take up another fact. In almost every Catholic country, there is a concordat or agreement, between the government and the Pope, one clause of which generally is, that all public correspondence shall pass through the office of the government. The object of this is to guard against any possibility of an encroachment by the Pope upon the temporal power or the conceded rights of the government. Spain has a clause of this nature in her agreement with the Pope; hence all public documents pass through the regular offices. Is this any diminution of the ecclesiastical authority of the Holy See? The only sanction which they received in the Council of the Indies, was a certificate that they contained nothing in derogation of the king's rights, or of the principles of the concordats.

It is a little too much to assert that "all the ecclesiastical revenues went to the king." They were but those revenues, out of which he was bound to support a very large establishment. The reviewer acknowledges that if he received copiously, he paid liberally. We will agree with the editor in what we believe to be his opinion. The establishment was far too numerous, and the church was a great deal too rich. And there were too many churches and chapels in South America, which is one reason why we think the king ought to have more fully and strictly enforced the restriction of building. One principle is very fair,—no man should be compelled to pay his money without his consent. We would have this apply to kings as well as to others. The fact is, the king had bound himself to support the churches and their pastors; was it then unfair that he should enact, that no new church should be built without his consent? We believe in America no one will contend, that it is unjust to restrict, by law, the amount of property which even private individuals shall be at liberty to place in mortmain for religious purposes. The King of Spain did no more than is done by our own legislatures, when he required that his license should be had for this alienation of property from temporal to ecclesiastical purposes.

There is an old custom in our church, which the Church of Eng-

land also retains, that every incumbent, upon receiving his benefice, shall pay what is called his annates, that is, a composition usually called his first fruits, or first year's income, to a fund for ecclesiastical purposes, viz., repairs of the church, enclosure of the cemetery, support of aged or poor clergy, maintenance of church officers, for whom no other or sufficient provision has been made, and so forth. In South America, the king paid all those expenses, and took the annates.

Our object being only to correct the mistakes of the Reviewer, and to give to our fellow-citizens such knowledge of facts as may be necessary for the vindication of our church, we must defer making any remarks until after we shall have concluded our examination, which we hope to do in our next.

SECTION V

We now insert the last portion of this very offensive article:

"No more than a very imperfect notion can be formed of the influence of the church establishment in South America, from the written statutes and regulations by which it was governed. The best laws may be abused, and will be abused, where there is not a stern and efficient power to put them in execution. To those parts of the laws of the Indies which relate to the church, little can be objected, considering the nature of the establishment. Their main defect is a want of appropriateness. They are explicit enough as to the public duties of the church officers, the modes of government, external regulations of churches and monasteries, collecting tithes, and taking care of the revenues; but they are nearly silent on things the most essential to secure to the people faithful, pious, and devoted religious teachers and pastors.[67] The laws come not down to these particulars; and from these alone, as displayed in the character and conduct of the clergy, can we judge of the actual tendency of the church establishment in the Spanish provinces, and of the gross abuses that were practised in defiance of its laws and its discipline. As illustrative of this subject, we will select two or three paragraphs from the letters of Mr. Pazos, who was a native of the country, and grew up from infancy amidst the scenes he describes. He is speaking of the *curas*, whose duty it was to teach the Indians, and the more ignorant classes of the people, and each of whom received a salary of not less than four thousand dollars. In this class of clergymen, if anywhere, we ought to expect faithful teachers. Look at the picture exhibited by this writer.

" 'Among the *curas* are many Europeans and others, who do not understand the Peruvian language, and who procure their parishes by the recommendation of the viceroy, or some Spanish chief. Although the canon law requires that the parish priests shall understand the language, and reason certainly demands the same thing, still his majesty dispenses with that knowledge in the qualifications of the *curas*, and there are therefore preachers and hearers who cannot understand each other! It is

[67] *Recopilacion de Ley. de Ind.* Lib. I. Tit. 1. De La Santa Fe Catolica. Tit. 2. De los iglesias.—Tit. 6. De los Arzobispos, Obispos, i Visitadores.—Tit. 10. De los Jueces Eclesiasticos.

sufficient for the *cura*, if his hearers understand these words, *Obvencion kolikata appamoon-keechoo?*—'Have you brought the money of the *obvenciones?*' The *obvenciones* are one of the modes of obtaining money, which is practised under the Roman religion. They include benedictions, masses, festivities of Christ, of the Virgin, and the saints, processions, marriages, funerals, and souls in purgatory. The *curas* and friars inculcate, with the most ardent zeal, the doing of good works here, in order to be happy hereafter. These good works consist in the festivities before mentioned, and saying masses. Every mass costs two dollars; if chaunted, the price is double. At Buenos Ayres, it is but one dollar. There is a royal tariff, *Arencel de Derechos*, which regulates the rates of these religious exercises.

"'The Indians, although ignorant of the principles of this religion, join in these festivities with great alacrity. They principally consist in masses chaunted with music, before the patron saints. The chaunters and musicians are Indians, who perform their parts with much skill, being excellent musicians, and chaunting Latin from memory, without understanding a word. At the time of mass, the Indian stands before the altar, covered with an oil cloth belonging to the Virgin or the saint, holding a flag in his hand; and at the end of the ceremony, the priest, covering the Indian's head with his mantle, says over him the beginning of the Evangelist of St. John: "*In principio,*" and so forth. This ceremony brings the *cura* from twenty-five to one hundred dollars, according to the dignity of the saints, and the solemnity of the mass.'" (pp. 86, 87).

"After speaking of the festive ceremonies and processions in the streets, dancing, mirth, and drinking, in all of which the 'Indian believes he is performing an acceptable service to his God,' the author proceeds as follows:

"'Besides the festivities in honour of the saints in heaven, there are others for souls in purgatory. The second of November in every year, is the day appointed by the Romish Church for that festivity. On that, hundreds of monks and priests inundate all the cities, villages, towns, and country chapels, in search of *responsos*, which are "Pater nosters," said to liberate souls from purgatory. This service, which occupies but a moment, costs six pence; and although the price is so trifling, it is a source of large income to the priests, as the people universally order *responsos* for their deceased relatives and friends.'" (p. 88).

"'From their religious festivities I now pass to their funerals. The tax levied upon these solemnities is most painful to the Indians, and the most barbarous avarice is displayed in its exaction. The sum which the Indian is obliged to pay is in proportion to his wealth, varying from $5 to $100. His property is narrowly investigated, and the violence of oppression unites to aggravate the afflictions of a man who has lost a father, a brother, or a wife. I have seen the poor Indian weep till his heart was well nigh broken, at the levying of this unjust contribution. But the European *curas*, whose hearts are harder than the gold they covet, turn a deaf ear to the widow, whose children are taken from her to pay this tax. A religion so abused, and transformed into a systematic mode of thieving and robbery, is a calamity more dreadful than a pestilence.'" (pp. 91, 92).

"Such are the perversions countenanced under the religious system which we have been describing. The laws and written rules of the church, it is quite certain, encouraged no such wicked abuses; but neither did they prevent them. Here was the root of the evil, and it was deep and strong. The establishment was majestic and imposing in its outward forms; its machinery was perfect, so far as it gave

universal patronage to the king, and filled his purse with gold. This end it attained, and this was all. The spiritual guides of the people were the worst enemies to their peace and happiness; precept and example conspired to scatter poison in the hearts of the unsuspecting, to corrupt the springs of good principle, and extinguish the light of moral truth. It would be uncharitable to suppose that there were not good men in the South American church, in the days of its worst condition; nay, history records the names of those who have been bright ornaments of their profession and of human nature. But this fact only adds darkness to the system itself, which raised such a torrent of iniquity, that wise and virtuous bishops, armed with all the power of the church, could not check nor turn it aside. Let the practical influence of this system, and its positive effects on the mind, moral sense, affections, social feelings, and religious principles of the people, be considered, and we doubt whether a spectacle more gloomy could be presented to the philanthropist, or the friend of human improvement and happiness.''

The reviewer here more distinctly places before us his authorities, and thus relieves himself in a great measure from responsibility. We are not aware of the character of Mr. Pazos; but we are acquainted with the principles of our religion, and we do know from authority upon which we can rely, the manner in which those principles are brought into action in South America. We also know the manner in which a certain description of writers exhibit our relation to a certain class of readers. Probably we had better, by giving a history of our own experience, show what we wish to convey. We have premised that we do not know Mr. Pazos: we do not know in what language he wrote, nor where his work was published. We therefore are not aware whether he ought to be included amongst any class of writers whom we designate as totally unworthy of credit.

We did at one period believe the Spaniards in Europe to be a most superstitious people, whose ignorance of the true principles of religion was exceeded only by the South Americans, and the Portuguese. We were led to this conclusion: 1, by the testimony of Spanish priests who, disgusted with the folly of the people, left the country; 2, by the testimony of well-informed Spaniards who left the country; 3, by the testimony of Roman Catholics of other nations, who had been amongst them; and 4, by the testimony of respectable Protestants who had travelled in Spain and Portugal, and South America, and who were liberal and honourable. With such impressions upon our minds, we attributed to weakness, or to a mistaken piety, the eulogies which we heard passed upon the clergy and people of Spain, by some ecclesiastics who had spent many years amongst them; we were by no means disposed to rely upon their testimony. Yet we found it to be so uniform and so consistent, that we were induced to examine closely. We did; and the result was, but not until after the lapse of a considerable time, that our

opinions were completely changed. We were convinced by evidence of testimony, and of their subsequent misconduct, that the first class of witnesses who testified to the superstition, were generally, indeed we do not recollect an exception, priests who either had been placed under censures, or not content to observe the laws of the church, had fled from their country, because they wished to escape punishment, and then to justify themselves and to flatter the prejudices of the Protestants amongst whom they found themselves, calumniated that religion and those institutions which would not tolerate their irregularities. The second class of witnesses, we generally discovered to be what are usually called men of the world, that is, men well informed upon most subjects except religion; men who were above what are called vulgar prejudices, that is, who cared nothing for the laws of the church; men who were liberal, that is, who laughed at the religion in which they had been brought up, and found that best which was most fashionable, who would be Roman Catholics in Paris, Protestant Episcopalians in New York, Church of England men in London, Calvinists in Geneva, and Puritans in Connecticut, Unitarians perhaps in Boston, and perhaps followers of the prophet, in everything but abstinences, in Constantinople. The third class of witnesses were too often not sufficiently acquainted with the language of the people or the customs of the country, and had but few opportunities in a galloping tour, to make minute inquiry, and very often also took the privilege of travellers. The testimony of the fourth class must necessarily be equivocal in its nature, whatever may be the integrity of the witness, because his own opinions and his want of a thorough acquaintance with the nature of our religion, must disqualify him. We have known witnesses of this description make the most flagrant mistakes, whilst they testified with the most conscientious integrity.

We know that it has lately become fashionable in England to seek after knowledge regarding Spain, and what were her colonies, and many persons have undertaken to write, who, in order to make their works profitable, must cater equally for the public prejudices, as for the public appetite for information. And no class of persons are more ready to direct their employers how to make a work fashionable, than the London booksellers. "A few side blows, sir, given to Popery; a few sentences against superstition; a few dashes against bigotry and ignorance, will do better, sir, to get off fifty or a hundred copies, than a ten guinea paragraph in a second-rate *Review*."

Another object at present with many who wish well to the independence of South America, is to make that cause as popular as may be; no better mode they think can be devised than by depicting the horrors

of the oppression from which they have escaped; John Bull groans too much under his own load of taxes, to permit that topic to be handled with too much freedom, and the oppressions of Popery are substituted, though in all conscience the oppression of the tithes in Great Britain and Ireland are ten times worse, especially as the Spaniards do not tithe the Protestants after having previously plundered them of their lands and their churches. But do not these men see that if they wrote for an inquiring people, their argument would avail nothing? For the republics continue that church as it was under the king.

Here are general reasons why we do not place any reliance upon such publications as we have alluded to. There are besides, special reasons why we disbelieve many of their allegations; first, because we have better evidences in contradiction; and secondly, because we have the best reason to know, that the principles of our religion are not such as they would lead their readers to infer.

As to the reviewer, he acknowledges two facts:—1. That but an imperfect notion of the influence of the church establishment can be formed from the written law. 2. That little can be objected to the laws of the Indies, respecting the church, considering the nature of that church. From this we should infer that he has [no complaint to make] of these laws, yet he tells us they want appropriateness. Now we ask in the name of common sense, how can he know that? He does not know our religion; he does not know the people—and still he says that laws are not appropriate, though he is ignorant upon both heads, of principles and facts. But he tells us they are nearly silent on the things most essential to secure to the people good and religious pastors. Why? For a very obvious reason. Because that was a subject which the canon law was to regulate, and with which the Council of the Indies had no concern, and it would be as ridiculous for the Council of Trent to legislate for the government of Massachusetts. Let him turn to the laws of the Council of Trent upon the subject, and he will find it amply and minutely regulated. Let him look to the sixth session of the Council of Trent, chapters i. and ii. on Reformation, and consult the several more ancient canons and decrees therein referred to, and he will find copious and distinct regulations for the securing to the people devoted and religious and learned bishops, and pointing out the manner of selecting, the mode of trying, and the extent and way of punishing the criminal or the negligent. In chapter iv., he will find the mode of visitation and its object.

The duties of the bishops are pointed out, (Sess. v. cap. 2, *de Reformat*, and Sess. xiii. Cap. 1, de Reform.) The duties of parish priests,

curas, and other such pastors, (Sess. xxiii. Cap. 1). The mode of examination and appointment, and so forth, (Sess. xxiv. cap. 18). General regulations for the conduct of all clergymen, (Sess. xxv. cap. 1, *de Reform.*) and so forth. We could multiply our references very easily, and prove distinctly that there did not exist in our church in South America a want of appropriate laws, but there did exist in the reviewer, a total want of information upon a subject which he was not qualified to write upon.

It may not be amiss here, to lay before our readers one or two extracts from those regulations which are not appropriate—which do not provide for giving devoted and religious pastors to the people.

Session XXV. Council of Trent, held on the 3d and 4th days of December, A. D. MDLXIII., being the 9th under Pius IV. Pope.

DECREE OF REFORMATION

Chapter I. It is to be wished that they who undertake the episcopal ministry, should recognise their duties, and understand that they are called not for their own profit, not to riches, or luxury, but to labours and cares of solicitude for the glory of God. Nor is it to be doubted, too, but the rest of the faithful would be more easily incited to the deeds of religion and innocence, where they saw their prelates thinking not of the things of the world, but of salvation of souls and of their heavenly country. As the holy synod perceives this to be a principal aid towards the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, it admonishes all bishops, that often meditating upon those things, they may show themselves fit for their situation in their acts, and in the whole conduct of their lives, which is a sort of perpetual preaching: and in the first place let them so regulate their whole deportment that the others may learn from their example the lessons of frugality, modesty, continence, and that holy humility which so much commends us to God. Wherefore, it not only commands after the example of our fathers in the Council of Carthage, that bishops be content with moderate raiment and furniture, and a frugal table; but moreover, that they do be careful in their whole mode of living and in their dwellings, that nothing shall appear which is not in accordance with this holy institute, nothing which will not exhibit simplicity, zeal for the service of God, and contempt of vanities.

"It entirely prohibits them from enriching their relations or acquaintances, or friends, by the revenues arising from the church: for the apostolic canons forbid the giving to relations the income of the church, which is the property of God; but if their relations are poor, let them be aided as poor; but let not the income be wasted or squandered on their account. Furthermore, the holy synod strenuously admonishes them entirely to lay aside all human attachments and affections of a worldly nature, for their brethren and their nephews and blood relations, because from them has arisen too often the cause of many evils to the church.

"It moreover decrees, that those things said regarding bishops, are to be observed not only by all others obtaining benefices, whether secular or regular, but also by the cardinals of the holy Roman Church: since as it is upon their advice to the holy Roman Pontiff, the administration of the universal church depends, it would be ex-

tremely improper that they should not shine in the marks of virtue, and discipline of life, which would deservedly turn the eyes of all upon them.''

From the highest to the lowest office in the church of Spain and South America, and everywhere else, special laws are made upon the principles of the above decree. Respecting the *curas* or parish priest, the Council of Trent enacts, (Sess. v. cap. 2, *de Ref*); that since the preaching of the Gospel is not less necessary than the reading thereof, these parish priests shall on Sundays and festivals preach, and this preaching is to be, informing their flocks in short discourses, the things necessary for salvation, and in plain language exhorting them to avoid the several vices, and to practise virtue so that they may escape eternal death, and obtain heavenly glory; also the nature of their spiritual duties. The bishop is to punish them, if they are negligent, and if they preach pernicious doctrine, he is to silence the transgressors. No person, though in orders, is to be allowed to preach, until examined by his superiors as to his mode of living, his morality, and his information.

We are obliged to close much sooner than we had intended this portion of our remarks. We shall, however, continue to examine all the remaining topics of the article. At present, we shall only assume that the reviewer has been much too hasty in his conclusion that the laws of our church were wanting in appropriateness, and did not provide for securing to the people good and devout and religious pastors. We should be glad, without meaning any disrespect to a particular body of persons, amongst whom we count many valuable friends, to compare the laws of our church in South America in that regard, with those of the society or church, we desire to give the name they prefer themselves, of the Unitarians, or of any other religious body in the world.

SECTION VI

We find the very serious errors in this article to multiply as we proceed in its examination. However, the respectability of the work must add great weight to the evil done to our religion, and will plead our excuse for the minute details of our correction.

In our last we showed the mistake of the editor respecting the appropriateness of our church laws in securing good pastors to the people. We now have to contend against the authority of Mr. Pazos, and labour under the inconvenience which must necessarily arise from ignorance of the character of the witness. However, we find in the very article itself a flagrant logical error,—that sophistry which draws a general conclusion from particular premises. Mr. Pazos tells us that ''among

the *curas* are many Europeans and others, who do not understand the Peruvian language." This is evidently confined to Peru, and clearly does not refer to all South America. Again, it refers to only some of the *curas,* not to all. Now, these two restrictions notwithstanding, we get the colouring from the *Review*, as if it related to all, or to the generality of the *curas* in South America. To be sure, you will not find it written by the reviewer in so many words—"The general body of the parish priests could not speak to their flock in a language which they could understand." But the proposition is insinuated both by Pazos and by the *Review*. Indeed Pazos tells us it was only necessary for the parish priest to be able to ask the Indian whether he brought money. And the reviewer took Mr. Pazos as ample authority.

We beg to inform him that this authority cannot be good, and next that his own expressions go farther than his authority. What are the facts?

In other parts of South America, as well as in Peru, many of the Indians did not understand Spanish, and many of the *curas* did not understand the Indian language; and the canon law does require the *cura* to know and to speak the language of his flock: the law was then appropriate. Yes; but the king dispensed with the law, and a *cura* was sent, who did not understand his flock, nor did the flock understand the priest. Such a fact might, and did rarely exist, yet the people were taught.

In South America there were and are many parishes in which a knowledge of the Indian dialect is not necessary, for it is not spoken, and the few Indians to be found in those places did understand Spanish. But the general law required *every cura* to speak the Indian dialect: in this place there was a special ground of exception, which was the basis of the dispensation. Mr. Pazos, then, did not make a correct statement. The bishop could not induct the *cura* until he had been examined as to his knowledge of the Indian tongue, and found competent to hear confessions and to preach; but in the case before us a dispensation from the law was granted, because the application of the law was not necessary.

But this, we will be told, is not the case which Mr. Pazos describes, for he expressly says, "there are therefore preachers and hearers who cannot understand one another."

We now come to that case. It is one which was very seldom found, and when found, is not what the reviewer imagines and Mr. Pazos insinuates. In a parish there are Spaniards and Indians: the cura does not understand the Indian language; the Spaniards, however, could understand the *cura*—when he preached, one part of his flock under-

stood him, the other did not. There were, indeed, in a few instances, preachers and hearers who did not understand one another. But this is not peculiar to South America; it was the case frequently in Ireland: the parish priest preached in English; half his congregation do not understand what he says. Another preaches in Irish; a large portion of the hearers do not know what he says. We have seen it in this city: a Roman Catholic clergyman preached in French; two-thirds of his congregation knew not what he said. The same case will be found in a thousand places. But is this not a very unnatural state of things? How can those people be instructed? Very easily. The *cura* has a vicar, or an assistant priest, who speaks the other language. Hence, though there may be a very few cases in which the *cura* does not understand some of his flock, and a portion of his flock cannot understand him, still there is an assistant who in those cases supplies the want. But there is no case in which the Indians are left in South America without a priest who speaks their language, though that priest is not always the parish priest. In the Roman Catholic Church, the clergyman must receive the penitent's confession; in South America the Indian must confess at least once in the year, so that such a case as Mr. Pazos insinuates cannot possibly exist. The Indian must be instructed in his own language; must repeat and understand the forms of prayer in his own language; must rehearse his catechism in his own language; must confess in his own language; and all this, and much more, required of every man, woman, and child arrived at the use of reason, must be done by the ministry of the priest. Any honest man, who has ever been in a Roman Catholic country, will instantly detect the criminal falsehoods of Mr. Pazos. The reviewer, having taken him as authority, cannot be responsible.

Mr. Pazos makes another mistake; for, though the canon law required that the parish priest shall understand the language, he tells us the king dispenses with that knowledge. That is, he gives the king a power to dispense with the canon law. This certainly was generous. In the proceedings of the Council of Trent (sess. xxi., cap. 6, de Reform.,) bishops were declared to have a remedial power. But we are not aware of any canon, usage, or decree, which gives a power of dispensing in canon law to the King of Spain, or to any other king. The truth is, the Spanish law regarding the colonies disqualified any priest, who did not understand the Indian dialect, from being inducted to a cure. But when the bishops stated that such knowledge was not required in a special case, the king's officer dispensed with the Spanish law, not with the canon law.

A single expression will frequently betray the character of a writer; and in the extract from Mr. Pazos we have not a few which prove to us demonstratively that, if he wrote in English, he was very badly instructed in the tenets and the practices of the Roman Catholic Church; and if he wrote in any other language, his translator was not a Roman Catholic, and could not express properly the ideas of the original. In the first place, if he was a Roman Catholic, he wrote a deliberate untruth when he penned this passage: "It is sufficient for the *cura*, if his hearers understand these words, *Obvencion kollkatta appamoon-keecho?* Have you brought the money of the *obvenciones?*" Secondly, his description of the *obvenciones* is totally and altogether incorrect. Thirdly, the title which he gives the religion is such as a Roman Catholic would not use. Fourthly, his statement regarding good works is an unprincipled calumny. We could add to these eight or ten internal evidences, in the quotation, of the position which we took at the commencement of this paragraph being perfectly correct.

But let us come to a few facts. "The *curas* and friars inculate, with the most ardent zeal, the doing of good works here, in order to be happy hereafter." This is really strange. So the *curas*, who were dumb dogs only five lines before, are now ardent and zealous preachers! ! Mr. Pazos will not after this assert that the age of miracles has passed away. "These good works consist in the festivities before mentioned, and saying masses." Now the festivities before mentioned were, we suppose, the *obvenciones.* "They include benedictions, masses, festivities of Christ, of the virgin, and the saints, processions, marriages, funerals, and souls in purgatory." It certainly will be a new idea to include funerals and souls in purgatory under the head of festivities, and the masses being included under the head *obvenciones*, and the good works consisting of festivities and saying masses. Although we are left to make out what notions we can from this involved sentence, we must either take the entire with its incongruities, or we must confine good works to festivities of Christ, of the virgin and the saints, and to saying masses. To have some precise idea, we must now know what is meant by festivities. Mr. Pazos is, unfortunately, not very explicit upon this head. He tells us "they principally consist in masses chaunted with music before the patron saint."—"At the time of mass, the Indian stands before the altar, covered with an old cloth belonging to the virgin or the saint, holding a flag in his hand; at the end of the ceremony, the priest covering the Indian's head with his mantle, says over him the 'beginning of the Evangelist of St. John,' '*In principio.*' " and so forth.

Now we defy any human being to make out of this more than the

following conclusion: "Good works consist in festivities and saying masses; and festivities consist principally in masses chaunted with music before the patron Saint." So that the upshot of the whole is, "Good works consist in saying masses and in chaunting masses." We shall now show the value of Mr. Pazos' testimony. He informs us that "Every mass costs two dollars; if chaunted, the price is double. At Buenos Ayres it is but one dollar." Thus, at most, the festivity or ceremony would bring the *cura* four dollars. Mr. Pazos informs us that "there is a royal tariff, *Arencel de Derechos*, which regulates the rates of these religious exercises." We should suppose he took his rates from this tariff. A chaunted Mass then in Buenos Ayres would bring the *cura* two dollars, and elsewhere four dollars. However, the gentleman's memory soon fails him, and at the end of the next paragraph the tariff is forgotten, for he assures us "This ceremony brings the *cura* from 25 to 100 dollars, according to the dignity of the Saints, and the solemnity of the Mass." How did this inconsistency escape the eye of the Reviewer? We really do not know of any mantle with which a priest covers the head of the persons over whom he reads. We know that there is a Gospel of St. John, the Evangelist—but we do not know how any priest could say "the beginning of the Evangelist of St. John." We know what the writer means to describe, but he has written such nonsense as we should never understand, if we were not fully acquainted with the subject of which he treats, but which he grossly misrepresents. He intended to describe the ceremony of the priest laying the end of his stole upon the head of the Indian, whilst he read the beginning of the Gospel of St. John; to show by the ceremony that the Indian was, by professing his belief of the contents of that Gospel, and particularly of the union of the divine and human nature in the person of our Saviour which is there related, joined to the public body of the church, and in communion with its public ministers.

Never was there a more gross misrepresentation than that of Pazos, regarding what are considered good works in the Roman Catholic Church in South America. The *curas* and friars of that portion of the church, hold and teach the doctrine of their brethren throughout the world. That doctrine is laid down in the sixth session of the Council of Trent, from which we shall give a few extracts:

Decree concerning Justification.[68]—*Preface.* Whereas, at the present time, not without the loss of many souls, and the grievous injury of ecclesiastical unity, certain erroneous doctrine respecting justification, is scattered abroad. For the praise and glory of Almighty God, the tranquillity of the church, and the salvation of souls,

[68] Session vi. Celebrated on the 13th day of the month of January, MDXLVII.

the holy and œcumenical and general Council of Trent, lawfully gathered in the Holy Ghost; therein presiding in the name of our most holy Father in Christ and Lord, Paul the Third, by divine providence, Pope—the most Rev. Lords Jo. Maria, Bishop of Prœneste, on the mountain, and Marcellus of the title of the Holy Cross of Jerusalem, Priest, both Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, and apostolic legates *a latere*; intends to explain to all the faithful of Christ, the true and sound doctrine regarding his justification, which the sun of justice Christ Jesus, the author and consummator of our faith, has taught, which the Apostles have delivered, and the Catholic Church at the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, has perpetually retained; strictly forbidding any person to dare henceforward to believe, to preach, or to teach otherwise than is established and declared in this present decree.

The Decree contains sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons. We shall give but a very few extracts:

Chap. 1. Teaches our fall in Adam, and our inability to save ourselves; 2, teaches that justification comes through Christ, our reedeemer; 3, They only are justified to whom the merits of redemption are applied; 4, explains the meaning of being born again of water and the Holy Ghost; 5, teaches that the grace of God excites the sinner to conversion, and if the sinner will co-operate with this grace, it will lead to his justification; 6, teaches the mode of preparation to be faith in the declarations of God, reliance on his grace, conviction of our criminality, fear of God's judgment, hope in his mercy to those who are converted through the merits of Christ, love of God, hatred of sin, penance, and leading a new life, with a determination to observe the commandments; 7, teaches the causes of justification and its effects, especially in confirming our faith and exciting us to good works; 8, explains what is meant by being justified by faith and gratis; 9, states the erroneous doctrine; 10, shows how, after justification, progress is made therein by faith and works, through the grace of Christ; 11, shows that every person is bound to observe God's commandments, and that their observance is within our power, if we be aided by God, who will bestow his aid to those who seek it, and then continues: "Wherefore it happens that those who are justified ought to feel themselves more bound to walk in the way of justice, as they having already been freed from sin, and are now made servants of God, they may be able to go forward, living soberly, and justly, and piously, through Christ Jesus, by whom also they had access into this grace; for God doth not desert those whom he hath once justified by his grace, unless he be deserted by them." And again: "Wherefore the Apostle admonishes those who have been justified. Know you not that they who run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain. I, therefore, so run not as at an uncertainty. I so fight, not as one beating the air: but I chastise my body and bring it into subjection: lest, perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a reprobate. So, too, the prince of the Apostles, Peter. Wherefore, brethren, labour the more, that by good works you may make sure your vocation and election: for doing those things, you shall not sin at any time." Chap. 12 warns against the danger of the doctrine of predestination; 13, treats of the gift of perseverance, and has the following expressions: "For God, unless they fall off from his grace, as he began a good work will perfect it, working in them both to will and to accomplish. Wherefore let those who think themselves to stand, take heed lest they fall, and with fear and trembling work their salvation in labours, in watchings, in alms-deeds, in prayer, and oblations, in fasting, and chastity: they

should fear, indeed, knowing that they are regenerated to the hope of glory, but not yet to glory itself, knowing also the contest in which they are engaged with the flesh, the world, and with the devil, in which they cannot be victorious, unless by the grace of God they obey the apostolic injunction: brethren, we are not debtors to the flesh, that we should live according to the flesh; for if you live according to the flesh, you shall die, but if by the spirit you mortify the works of the flesh, you shall live."

Chapter 14 treats of those who fall from their justified state, and the mode of their renewal, and desires that they shall be taught that the penance must contain "not only the cessation from sins and detestation of them, or a contrite and humble heart, but moreover, their sacramental confession, or the desire thereof at least, and the making thereof at the proper time, and the absolution of the priest, as also satisfaction by fastings, by alms-deeds, by prayers, and by other pious exercises of a spiritual life: not as satisfaction indeed for the eternal punishment which is remitted, together with the guilt, either by the sacraments or by the desire thereof, but for the temporal punishment which, as the sacred Scripture teaches us, is not always entirely remitted, as in baptism, to those who have with ingratitude grieved the Holy Ghost, and feared not to violate the temple of God."

Chapter 15 teaches that by any mortal sin grace is lost, though faith is not always lost. Chapter 16 treats of the fruits of justification, the merit of good works, and the value and nature of that merit; upon which latter point it states that God in the excess of his goodness crowns his gifts in us, so that what his mercy has enabled us to do, is by him regarded as our merit.

In those passages which teach the nature and the value of good works, continual reference is made to the lessons of our Saviour in the gospels, to those of the Apostles in their writings; and if masses, processions, and benedictions are recommended, they are as helps only to obtain grace to do the works of the Spirit. Never was there an unfortunate paragraph which, in so few words, contained more falsehoods and a greater number of ridiculous blunders, not to mention its contradictions, than this, which the reviewer selects from Mr. Pazos. The very phraseology betrays a writer who knows nothing of the subject which he treats of—"and saying masses"—no person but a bishop or a priest can say mass. So that if the good work consisted in saying the mass, the Indian thus described would have none of the merit of the good work. But we are tired of this accumulation of blundering falsehood and contradiction. However, it must all, we suppose, be true; for Mr. Pazos was born in Peru, and grew up in Peru—and because Mr. Pazos is a native South American, the Roman Catholic religion must be what it is not.

But we must here address ourselves to the reviewer himself. We ask him who authorized him to publish that a Roman Catholic Indian believes he is performing an acceptable service to his God in "dancing, mirth and drinking?" Does Mr. Pazos authorize the editor of the

North American Review to assert this? If he does not, who does? We have spoken upon the subject with intelligent Protestants, who have spent much time in South America, and they authorize us to say it is not true. Neither is it true that those Indians are so ignorant as they are represented. The Roman Catholic Church has done more in any one province of South America to civilize and to Christianize the Indians, than all the other churches in the world have done all over the globe: and yet we are told of their ignorance! Come, you who revile us, exhibit your works; what have you done with the millions which have been collected for the conversion of the heathen? We will not speak of the East, we will not mention the North. We shall not produce Paraguay —we omit Colombia—we shall pass over Mexico. We meet Mr. Pazos upon his native soil. We assert that there is at this moment a more accurate knowledge of the facts and principles of the Gospel amongst a greater number of the aborigines of Peru, than amongst all the other Indians in the whole world, who do not belong to the Roman Catholic Church.

We have now lying before us upwards of forty volumes of the reports of our missionaries in the several parts of the world, and their contents are not vapid declamations, but substantial facts. We know the mode in which an impression is made upon the senses of the child of nature, not that the essence of religion consists in the mode of making that impression, whether it be by a procession or by a benediction, or by any other mode you please. The object is, by the impression, to teach a lesson of the deepest religious importance, and by repeating the impression to repeat the lesson. We can, in a conversation, inform the child of the forest of the death of the Redeemer, and before we could teach him to read a Bible we could show him a picture, and we could tell him of the fact whilst we left him the memorial; and where is the difference as to the result, if by a tedious process we taught him to read the same fact in the letters of the alphabet or on the engraver's plate? It is true, reading will extend his stock of knowledge, but we can teach five thousand by pictures before we could teach one with a book. The picture and image mode is suited to the infancy of the human mind, the reading mode is better suited to its maturity. Processions and other ceremonies are means, not the end, of religion, nor are they its essence. When our religion is described to consist only of the means, the essence is omitted, and we are misrepresented. Most of those writers who assail us are guilty of this; many conscientious, good men of other communions, see the means, but do not look to their relation; they are deceived, and without a criminal intention they deceive others.

There is another misrepresentation which operates against us. The facts which are substantially true are caricatured, and thus given to the world greatly distorted.

However, we must endeavour to finish our examination of Mr. Pazos, who again calls the second of November a festivity!!! No wonder that he should: in a former passage he called a soul in purgatory "a festivity." It is true that the 2d of November is the solemn commemoration of all souls; on that day masses are offered up, and prayers are said for the aid, and towards the liberation, of the souls in purgatory, not only in South America, but all over the entire western and southern patriarchates. Other days are observed for the same purpose in the other partriarchates. But it is not true that sixpences (by-the-by, we did not know they had such a coin as a sixpence in Peru,) are paid for "pater nosters" to the monks and priests. This is a gross falsehood: a dollar might be paid in some instances, or half a dollar to the priest who celebrates a mass, but generally no priest is permitted to celebrate mass oftener than once in the day; by a special custom, in some parts of South America, a priest might on the 2d of November celebrate three masses. But the purchase of "pater nosters" would be gross simony, and punishable by the laws of the church in the most decisive and summary manner.

The statement respecting the funerals is equally incorrect. We wonder Mr. Pazos did not call the funeral a festivity! We know very good Protestant churches which would be very loath to content themselves, however, with the fees that are levied by those "European *curas*, whose hearts are harder than the gold they covet." The "barbarous avarice displayed in their levying of the funeral tax," varies its demand from five dollars to one hundred dollars, which the poor Indian is obliged to pay: and who can doubt the correctness of the statement, for Mr. Pazos "has seen the poor Indian weep till his heart was wellnigh broken at the levying of this unjust contribution." This is really lamentable. Yet this generous Indian would drink, and dance, and walk in procession, and have his head covered with the mantle at the reading of the beginning of the evangelist of St. John, and hold a flag whilst he stood covered with an old cloth belonging to the Virgin, whilst mass was chaunted on earth before the patron saint that was in heaven, and he very willingly and unnecessarily paid from twenty-five to one hundred dollars for this, though it was only tariffed at one or two, or four dollars at the most, and he was not bound to have it done at all. Yet he generously gave his dollars then, and now he cries almost to the breaking of his heart, under the view of the consistent Mr. Pazos, who we sup-

pose wept too, and all this because he is required to pay five dollars for a funeral, whereas in a good Protestant church in the city of Charleston, in South Carolina, he should pay fifty dollars in some, and upwards of one hundred dollars in some others. Yet the hearts of the people of Charleston are soft as the paper of the notes which they receive, and those of the *curas* are harder than the gold which they covet. So much for the difference between paper and gold, between a South American Catholic and a North American Protestant. "And the wailing widow's children are taken from her to pay this tax." Really we feel so disgusted with the libel that we are at a loss how to treat it seriously, and we cannot stoop to levity. We did see a caricature which only told the truth. It exhibited a clergyman seizing upon the tenth pig, and upon the tenth potato, and upon the tenth hen, and upon the tenth egg, but refusing the tenth child, and this in the midst of a people one-tenth of whom did not receive his ministry. Which was the more disgusting picture? Why shall we be driven to exhibit scenes that we wish, for the sake of humanity, for the sake of charity, to hide? And if the orphan child was taken from the widowed mother, for what purpose was it taken? Could the *cura* turn the child to gold? But why play with a falsehood? Mr. Pazos has here capped the climax of his misrepresentation. The Roman Catholic Church in South America, as elsewhere, observes the canons which command the *curas* or parish priests under the penalty due to simony, to give, gratis, the rites of interment and sepulture, to all those who die in their communion, and are unable to pay the usual fees. Those canons go farther, and forbid the parish priest to yield so far to avarice, as to permit even a voluntary subscription to be made in such a case. They command him to have it done gratis. These canons are observed in South America; they are not in the United States, because, as yet, the influence of those persons who attempted to rear the edifice of Catholicism upon a Protestant foundation, is not altogether destroyed.

We have now disposed of this good Peruvian's fictions; of what value is his conclusion? "A religion so abused, and transformed into a systematic mode of thieving and robbery, is a calamity more dreadful than a pestilence."

The picture is not fairly drawn. Our church is belied, and then we are abused for folly which is not ours—for criminality which we abhor. We say these are not facts:—they are fictions, misrepresentations, inconsistencies, contradictions. Mr. Pazos was born in Peru. This is no guarantee for his having stated the truth. Upon what do we question his veracity? Upon the testimony of clergymen and laymen whom we

know to be honourable—upon the internal evidence of his own ignorance or that of his translator—upon the ground that he contradicts himself—upon our knowledge of the law and the custom not being what he states them to be—upon the inconsistency of asserting those assumed oppressions to have been among the principal causes of the revolution, and their being permitted to continue, though that revolution has been most successful—and lastly, upon the unimpeached and unimpeachable characters of the South American prelates, who must have been the worst perjurers, the vilest hypocrites, and the most inhuman monsters, if they permitted those evils to exist.

SECTION VII

After the close examination which we felt obliged to make of the article respecting that portion of our church which is in South America, it must be plain to those who have had the patience to read it, that the reviewer had a very imperfect notion of the subject upon which he expatiated, and that his authorities have egregiously misled him.

It is plain that he knew nothing of the nature or of the history of the *Bula de Cruzada.* It is very evident that Mr. Depons taught him what was not the fact respecting the Bull of Composition; and any Roman Catholic could instantly detect his own great mistakes regarding the *Bula de Defuntos.* Upon those mistakes and errors, he based his introductory paragraph in which he asserts that those bulls corrupted the morality of the people. If teaching a man to repent for his sins, if holding out strong inducements to prayer, if encouraging to frequent the institutions of religion, especially the sacraments of our blessed Redeemer, if insisting upon his restoring ill-gotten wealth to its owner, and compelling him to use every diligence to discover that owner, and when he made oath that his search was fruitless, causing him to pay it into the public treasury for national purposes, and transferring the estimate of the restitution which he should make, from his own partial judgment, to an impartial tribunal: if all this was corrupting the morals of the people, then those bulls encouraged the vices of the people. But upon what does the assertion rest that these precious devices of superstition were employed by alarming the religious fears of the people, to wring from them the little that remained after the torturing engine of taxation had done its heaviest work? It is true the people were told, and are still told in every Roman Catholic country, in every Roman Catholic tribunal of confession, from every Roman Catholic altar, that if they unjustly detain the property of their neighbours, they can never enter hea-

ven. If this be a device of superstition, we acknowledge that to us it is so precious that we will guard it as the apple of our eye, and so will our brethren through the world. Yes, we will, after taxation has done its heaviest and its lightest work, in his progress through life, upon the very threshhold of eternity, we will alarm the religious feelings of the unjust man and still tell him, though it were to wring from him the whole of what he possessed, "Restore to its proper owner what does not belong to you. What does it profit a man to gain the whole world, and to lose his own soul? Of what value are the riches which he left after him upon the earth, to the tortured rich man in hell?" Would to God that the principles of infidelity which Mr. Depons and his associates have disseminated, had left this precious portion of our superstition as strong as it was before such men began to shed their lurid beams upon the people; and these men called the murky meteors by the name of light!! These bulls wrung nothing else from the people, save the fruits of their injustice, "the property obtained by modes which ought to have conducted them to the gallows." All else was voluntary; it was, therefore, not wrung from them.

"The people were to be again plundered by this infamous juggling artifice to stir up their passions and interests, and even to quicken their crimes, where this could be done with a better prospect of grasping their money." Now we are altogether at a loss to conceive upon what premises these conclusions could rest. "The passions are stirred up by repentance for sin, by receiving the sacraments, by making restitution." "The interests of the penitents are stirred up, by making them disgorge what they have swallowed down by their avarice and injustice." "The crimes of the people are quickened by leading them to prayer and to repentance, and to restitution." We are totally at a loss to know how those conclusions are established. In those practices and regulations, we can perceive no "mockery of religion," no "league with the powers of darkness." The reviewer informs us, however, that "this league with the powers of darkness, is fast dissolving; religion could not be mocked, nor justice outraged any longer, and if the revolution had done no other thing than relieve the minds of sixteen millions of people from a thraldom so barbarous and debasing, the deed would of itself be a good reward, for the sacrifices and sufferings thus far endured by the South Americans gaining their independence."

After reading this passage, of course the reviewer must be under the impression that a great good has been achieved, the minds of the people have been relieved from the barbarous and debasing thraldom, justice is no longer outraged, religion is no longer mocked, the revolu-

tion has destroyed the league which existed with the powers of darkness. Yet in page 207, we are informed that in Mexico "up to this very year considerable revenue has continued to be raised by the sales of bulls and indulgences." Thus, either the people are, the revolution notwithstanding, as oppressed as ever, or else these were not considered by them to be oppressions. However, the reviewer adds, that it probably was necessary for a time to tolerate those abuses, as well on account of the habits of the people as the unsettled state of the revenues. Upon this ground we perfectly agree with the editor. We do consider the present mode of raising this tax to be little less than an abuse, and we do hope to see it abolished, and give way to better and more liberal institutions, though it was not and is not so abominable an accumulation of cruelty and fraud as he was led to imagine. We look upon it to be very badly adapted to the present times, though useful at its origin. We believe it has outlived its utility. It can be even now defended upon principle, but it is not, we think, equally beneficial in practice, as it has been, and except so far as the Bull of Composition, we should be glad to find it discontinued. But the work must be left to the good sense of a people who have proved themselves worthy of freedom, and to the piety and judgment of bishops who know the people and their circumstances, and at the head of whom is one who is as eminent for his learning as he is for his piety, and who proved to Iturbide that the Archbishop of Mexico preferred the independence of his country to the trappings of an ephemeral emperor.

One remark of the reviewer we cannot pass over without notice. After describing the imaginary mischiefs of *curas* who could not teach their flocks, and flocks who could not be instructed—after taking the assertion of Mr. Pazos, which, contrary to the fact, made the religion of the Indies consist in mere external show, and his own paragraph, which asserts that the Catholic Church permitted these people to believe that dancing, mirth, and drinking, were the chief ingredients of piety; after weeping with the wailing widows, and the heart-broken, we mistake, almost heart-broken Indians; after the inveighing against the hearts harder than gold of the avaricious *curas,* who contrived to force Indians to pay such vast sums which they were not compelled to pay, he tells us "such are the perversions countenanced under the religious system which we have been describing. The laws and written rules of the church, it is quite certain, encouraged no such wicked abuses; but neither did they prevent them." One point, then, is certain. The church is excused from the criminality of encouraging such abuses. Of course that church which does not encourage them does not enact them. They

are, then, no part of her discipline; she is only chargeable with not preventing them. Against the host of writers and declaimers who perpetually assail us and insult us, and proclaim calumnies in place of truth, we may henceforth quote the authority of the *North American Review*, to maintain the position that those abuses are not precepts, are no part of our discipline, are not encouraged by our church. We shall ourselves undertake to show that the church did prevent them. But first let us keep close to our kind friend, the reviewer: "The laws and written rules of the church did not encourage such wicked abuses." We thank you for the testimony. It is a judgment of truth. The laws and written rules of the church form its precepts. These laws, these rules, these precepts, did not encourage those wicked abuses. Yet we are gravely told that the "precept and the example of the pastors conspired to scatter poison in the hearts of the unsuspecting, to corrupt the springs of good principle and to extinguish the light of moral truth." The precept is to be found in the laws and rules, or nowhere. Now the reviewer is our authority for asserting that it is quite certain the laws and written rules, that is the precepts, did not encourage wicked abuses. And the reviewer is our authority exactly within eight lines after (p. 192), for asserting that precept did aid to scatter poison in the hearts of the unsuspecting, to corrupt the springs of good principle, and to extinguish the light of moral truth; and really we know not what wicked abuses are, if poisoning hearts, corrupting good principles, and extinguishing the light of moral truth, be not wicked abuses.

We may be asked, whether this is not a palpable contradiction. In place of giving an immediate answer, we shall give an explanation. We have too much respect for the editor of the *Review* to suspect him of bad intentions, and we are too soberly sad at this exhibition to treat with levity a cause of our unfeigned sorrow. We almost daily are doomed to witness exhibitions like the present, and we shall endeavour to account for them.

In a country like this, which has been nursed in prejudices against our creed, where, until very lately, except in a few of the principal cities, a well-informed Catholic could scarcely be found, and where everything in early education and after-reading was calculated to impress the youthful mind that our religion was a system of slavish delusion, groaning under the tyrannical sway of an ignorant, arrogant, and corrupt priesthood, leagued with the most unprincipled despots; that its component parts were superstition and persecution; that its characteristics were avarice and profligacy, chiefly exhibited in gross simoniacal traffic of pardons for all sins past, present, and to come, in exchange for money;

in a country where the press, the fashion, the usages, and the historical recollections and family affections were all in arms against us, not twenty years since, it could not be expected that the mind would be free to form a correct, an unbiased judgment in our case. The reviewer, we suppose, like many other good men, whom we know, made inquiry to the best of his opportunity for correct information, anxious to discover truth. He, unfortunately, like many others, fell upon bad authorities. Yet even in those he found, the laws of the church, to a certainty, did not encourage abuses which he was told did exist. He made the avowal honestly. Yet, he was also told the abuses do exist. He believed they did, and not being acquainted with our law,—and how can we blame his want of opportunity?—he concluded, though the law does not encourage, yet the law does not prevent—"Here, then, is the root of the evil, and it is deep and strong." In his youth the current of his ideas flowed through the channel which had been made by misrepresentations; his own inquiry had taught him to discover the error; he weakly damned up the entrance, but his knowledge of facts was not sufficient to enable him to make the new passage, and the accumulation of his thoughts pressing for a vent, broke down the weakest obstacle which opposed its egress, swept his new work away, and his words expressing his thoughts exhibited the return to his ancient course, and the contradiction to his modern assertions was too apparent. It is not the self-contradiction of a weak or of a wicked mind, but it is the struggle of an honest and of a strong mind, between prejudice by prescription and want of correct information on one side, and partial disclosure of truth and honesty on the other side.

The reviewer would find in the canon law, of our church, which is in force in South America, that the church did by her precepts, by her injunctions, and by her punishments "prevent those wicked abuses." Her bishops and officials were upon entering into their offices sworn solemnly and publicly to enforce those precepts, to have those injunctions observed, and to inflict those punishments. And that they did their duty, we are to presume, for we do not learn that the people even in the very moment of the revolutionary enthusiasm, whilst they declared and protested against every "wicked abuse," did at any moment, complain of ecclesiastical oppression, or of the abuses of church government. On the contrary, with an extraordinary unanimity, they preserve all its institutions unchanged whilst they change everything else. They abolish the Inquisition it is true, but the Inquisition is a state tribunal, not an ecclesiastical establishment; it is no more the part of the Roman Catholic religion than the English law which condemned a Catholic clergyman to death for saying Mass, or the New England law which con-

demned a Roman Catholic clergyman to death, for being found in the settlements of the Pilgrims, was a portion of the English Protestant creed or of the American Puritan religion. The fact of the republic's having placed the Catholic religion upon the same footing as it was under the kingly government, is a convincing proof that those revolutionists found nothing of oppression or of opposition to the spirit of republicanism in that religion.

The reviewer complains bitterly of the low state of information in South America, and tells us, page 194, "the monastic darkness of the twelfth century, hung over all the universities and colleges of South America, down to the very beginning of the Revolution." Page 195, "No provision was made for enlightening the community at large by founding schools for children, or communicating in any manner the first elements of education; no books were circulated, no teachers employed, no money granted." Page 196, "Down to the end of the 18th century, we believe there were but three presses, in all Spanish America." "But the obstacle to the intellectual progress of South America, which was the most intolerable because the most degrading of all, was the tribunal of the Holy Inquisition." In his portion of the article on the ecclesiastical hierarchy, (p. 190,) the Inquisition "sought importance chiefly by the vigilance with which it guarded against the inroads of knowledge, and the zeal with which it drew closer and closer the veil of ignorance over the minds of the people." Page 194, we find an extract from some anonymous writer which the reviewer introduces. "In the year 1678, a college was founded at Caraccas, which was afterwards raised to a university, and which, with the college and Latin schools appended to it, was usually furnished with ten or twelve professors. The manner in which these teachers were employed is thus described."

"Three professors teach enough of Latin to read Mass, Aristotle's Physics, and the philosophy of Scotus, which still prevailed at this school, 1808. A professor of anatomy demonstrates anatomy, explains the laws of animal life, the art of curing, and so forth, on a skeleton and some preparations in wax. Five professors are occupied in teaching theology and the canon law. One only, the most learned of course, is employed to defend the doctrine of St. Thomas on the immaculate conception against all heretics, and no diploma can be obtained without having sworn to a sincere belief in this revered dogma. The university has also a professor, who teaches the Roman laws, the Castilian laws, the laws of the Indies, and all other laws. A professor of vocal church music forms part of this hierarchy of instruction, and teaches to the students of law and medicine, as well as to those of theology, to sing in time and harmony the airs of the Roman ritual."[69]

Upon this we shall remark that the author labours under three very

[69] *Colombia*; being a Geographical, Statistical, Agricultural, Commercial, Political, Account of that Country. Vol. I, p. 96.

serious mistakes. 1. So far from its being a heresy to deny the doctrine of the immaculate conception, it has been decided, that as yet there is no evidence to show that any revelation has ever been made upon the subject, and any person who would style an impugner thereof a heretic, subjects himself to excommunication. 2. The clause of the oath does not require the person receiving the diploma to believe the doctrine to be true, but for the peace of the church, and uniformity of the schools requires that he shall not teach in contradiction to the opinion, for it is not a doctrine. 3. We will add that so far from the doctrine of the immaculate conception being the opinion of St. Thomas, he was the leader of those who opposed [70] it, and it is opposed to this day, by all the schools of his order. It is not a doctrine of faith, because the church possessing either no evidence or not sufficient evidence of its having been taught by the Saviour or his Apostles has refused to decide either for or against its truth, but has issued a mandate to the disputants on each side, charging them, under penalty of excommunication, to refrain from asserting that their opponents were heretics. The accuracy of the writer may be appreciated from this, that in three lines he has stated three untruths. The fact is, those men do not care to learn any facts regarding Roman Catholics, but look upon it as a matter of course that the vast majority of the Christian world must be blockheads, whom they, of course, must hold up to ridicule. We beg leave also to assure the reviewer that the quantity of Latin necessary for the celebration of Mass is not to be known without a better knowledge of syntax and prosody than many of our North American universities do at the present moment possess. We can assure him also that we have seen wax preparations in probably the best medical school in Europe, and that they were considered its most valuable stock for demonstration in particular cases,

[70] In 1854, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin was solemnly declared an article of Catholic faith. Hence today, no Catholic is free to oppose or deny this point of revealed doctrine. Bishop England's statement that St. Thomas was the leader of those who opposed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is neither accurate nor correct. It can not be shown that St. Thomas controverted the question as it is *now dogmatically defined.* There are solid reasons for believing that, in the time of St. Thomas, "Immaculate Conception" conveyed the idea of a doctrine substantially different from the doctrine enunciated in 1854. Theologians, able and prominent, assert that it is impossible to give any conclusive decision concerning the attitude of St. Thomas towards the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It is true, however, that the Dominican theologians, as a body, opposed the doctrine in the precise form in which it now stands among the dogmas of the Church. But even here there are found grave and profoundly learned members of the Dominican Order dissenting from the general body. As a rule, a study of the historical features of a controversy, like the present one, helps much in bringing about a satisfactory solution. But here history avails but little. The vague signification given, in the 13th and 14th centuries, to the terms "Immaculate Conception" and "Original Sin" gives rise to difficulties which neither study nor learning can remove.—Ed.

at the same time that subjects were absolutely necessary in others. The gentleman forgot to state that instead of five professors of theology, it would be more correct to read one of natural philosophy, three of theology, and one of canon law. Nor do we believe the reviewer would quarrel with us for adding that the Roman law was a good thing to teach, especially to such young gentlemen as should practise even in a North American Court of Admiralty.

We shall now show pretty clearly that even if all this supposed darkness was greater, still it did not exceed what was to be found at the same period in good Protestant countries, where no Papist would be admitted, and no Inquisition was to be found. Our conclusion then will be that if the coexistence of Popery and ignorance proves that Papists are enemies to improvement, *pari ratione*, the coexistence of Protestantism and ignorance will prove that Protestants are enemies to improvement, and we shall stand, as we always wish, upon the very same ground with our neighbours. We have seen what South America was in 1678. Now let us look to North America in 1671, and if the reviewer pleases we shall gratify the most ravenous appetite upon the subject.

"PROGRESS OF THE PRESS"[71]

"We live in an eventful era, which demands from all who are now existing every information, however trivial it may be of the habits and customs of those with whom we were when our national faculties first began to dawn. Being now in my 64th year, and contrasting the now with the past, wonder and astonishment overwhelm me, and terms sufficiently strong are wanting to give to my mind its feelings. Casting my eye over the first volume of Ramsay's *History of the United States*, page 264, I find that in the year 1671, sixty-four years after the settlement of Virginia, Sir William Berkeley, its governor, says,—'I thank God there are no free schools, nor printing presses, and I hope we shall not have them these one hundred years. God keep us from both.' Thus he wrote to the British ministry. The same spirit and disposition operates on his successors; every effort was doubtless used by them to keep us as much as possible in barbaric ignorance. But somehow or other it happened that while these were their views, to save appearances, and that in the historic page it might be seen they did pay some regard to the cultivation of science, and improvement of the minds of those thus subjected to their control, in the reign of William and Mary, a college in the then capital of Virginia, (Williamsburg,) was founded, and with requisite funds endowed. There the youth of the day were educated: those who were not able to pay for tuition, and so forth, received it (not exceeding a specified number,) gratuitously. Tradition informs me that my maternal grandfather was in the number of those who shared in its benevolence, and with difficulty extricated himself from its walls when, more than one hundred years ago, it was burnt down. Having received a liberal education, in conjunction with others of his compeers, and sorely lamenting the deprivations laboured under with respect to the diffusion of sentiment and commun-

[71] From the *Richmond Enquirer*.

ication of passing events, by and through the medium of the press, which was absolutely (I am told, and from what is before stated is certain) prohibited, he, my grandfather, associated with three or four others of the Williamsburg citizens, undertook, and for a considerable time penned a weekly paper, giving copies of it to the city and its neighborhood, filled with all the foreign and domestic intelligence they collected. But the work was an arduous one—and the demand far exceeding their means or power to supply, they contrived to smuggle a printer and his press into the city, and in spite of the governmental interdict, issued a weekly paper. Such, sirs, and I do believe I am correct in saying, was the origin of printing in the State of Virginia."

North America became independent and broke through the restraints, and went forward in the march of improvement. South America has become independent, and the reviewer informs us, page 196, "Presses have been multiplied since the revolution, and newspapers published in every part of the continent." Page 195, "It redounds much to the honour of this new republic, and is at the same time a test of the wisdom of its rulers, and a pledge of the success of the government, that a very marked attention has been given to the subject (education), as well in the constitution and laws, as in the practical administration of the rulers to whom the political concerns of the country have been thus far entrusted." A large portion of them are Roman Catholic clergymen, many of them ignorant *curas* with hard hearts. "Primary schools are organizing in every province, city, and village, as fast as the means and condition of the people will permit." They are still "under the control of bishops and other ecclesiastics."

At the other side of the Atlantic, about the same period, we may judge in what estimation profane learning was held in a free country, not Catholic, by the fact of its being considered too mean an occupation for a wise assembly that could put the following notes upon the Bible. We only take the first two which we fall upon accidentally: upon *Genesis* xvii. 9.

"Two kids seem to be too much for a dish of meat for an old man, but out of both, they might take the choicest parts, to make it dainty; and the juice of the rest might serve for sauce, or for the rest of the family, which was not small."

"He sent forth soldiers to kill the children, under two years of age, without any legal trial."—*Matthew* ii. 16.

Nor can we have a very exalted opinion of the literary acquirements of a colony which enacted "That no woman shall kiss her child on a sabbath or fast day." It is painful to us to make these allusions, but it is also very painful to us to have ourselves and our brethren in the faith, and our whole religious system misrepresented and aspersed, and made the topic for aged garrulity, for senatorial declamation, the target of literature, the easy theme for the vapid spouting of every school com-

mencement, and the associated object of folly and crime in the imagination of every infant, just escaped from the nursery. We shall never complain of a true statement of facts, but we shall call upon those who misrepresent us to prove the correctness of their assertions, and we shall give our reasons for ours. Truth will thus be elicited. We now believe that we have shown imperfectly, for we desired to be brief: That our religion was not the cause of ignorance in South America, for the same cause that restrained learning there, restrained it at the same time in other places in which our religion was not permitted to exist. The reviewer himself proves it too, in page 198.

"This jealousy of the Spanish government continued till the last, and the severity of its absurd attempts to stop the progress of intelligence seemed to be redoubled, as time and circumstances drew things to a crisis, which gave cause for new alarms. As late as the year 1804, a public vessel was dispatched from Havana to Baltimore, with orders to take home fifteen or twenty young men, natives of South America, who were at that time students in the Catholic seminary of St. Mary's in Baltimore.[72] Such was the fear that the seeds of liberal principles might gain admittance into a soil, which it had been the chief purpose of a great nation for many ages to disgrace with servitude, and desolate with plunder."

He says that encouragement is now given; and that encouragement is evidently given by Roman Catholics. It is therefore clear that our religion was not the cause of the want of knowledge.

"Such are the perversions countenanced under the religious system, which we have been describing. The laws and written rules of the church, it is quite certain, encouraged no such wicked abuses; but neither did they prevent them. Here was the root of the evil, and it was deep and strong. The establishment was majestic and imposing in its outward forms; its machinery was perfect, so far as it gave universal patronage to the king, and filled his purse with gold. This end it attained, and this was all. The spiritual guides of the people were the worst enemies to their peace and happiness; precept and example conspired to scatter poison in the hearts of the unsuspecting, to corrupt the springs of good principle, and extinguish the light of moral truth. It would be uncharitable to suppose that there were not good men in the South American church in the days of its worst condition; nay, history records the names of those, who have been bright ornaments of their profession and of human nature. But this fact only adds darkness to the system itself, which raised such a torrent of iniquity, that wise and virtuous bishops, armed with all the power of the church, could not check nor turn it aside. Let the practical influence of this system, and its positive effects on the mind, moral sense, affections, social feelings, and religious principles of the people, be considered, and we doubt whether a spectacle more gloomy could be presented to the philanthropist, or the friend of human improvement and happiness."

Good God! did the reviewer think when he penned this atrocious libel, that the members of the Roman Catholic church had no feelings? The miserable exception which he makes in favour of a few good men,

[72] Brackenridge's *Voyage to South America*, vol. i. p. 47.

is the most insulting passage of the entire. Our whole system is so bad that no efforts of good men can cure it. Its practical influence was in full vigour in Paraguay; and we ask, did that happy, and civilized, and thriving nation of reclaimed children of nature present a gloomy spectacle to the philanthropist, or to the friend of human improvement and happiness? No, sir, we defy the world to exhibit to us a more cheering spectacle of improvement and happiness, until the philosophist minister of a European despot, feared that the love of moderate and well-regulated and parental government, which cherished virtue, and allured from vice, would become contagious; and with his calumnious breath poisoned the minds of the rulers of the earth against the authors of that improvement; whilst he rudely trampled on the liberties and the comforts of a happy race, he congregated a band of infidels, and formed a conspiracy which was but too successful against such improvement in time to come.

So far from there being only a few good men in the mass of ecclesiastical corruption in South America—there were a few corrupt, as must always be expected, amidst a host of good men. Are the present clergymen the degraded beings which your charitable hand depicts? The republics will contradict the supposition. Whither then have those bad men, those monsters of iniquity gone? Whence have their successors come? Sir, you have been misinformed; we request you will be more cautious in taking the assertions of our enemies in future. We respect you, and would not willingly believe that you would intentionally misrepresent us.

We also desire to see a close and harmonious bond of union between our republics and those in the South. The misrepresentation of their religion, to which they are strongly attached; the ridicule of practices which they love, is not the way to win their confidence. This overzealous abuse of our religion did much to protract the struggle of our own revolution. When the late Archbishop Carroll was engaged by General Washington to induce the Canadian clergy to join in the revolutionary struggle, we understand his mission totally failed from the lavish abuse of popery in which the old colonies had indulged. The Canadians pointed out the several documents, from New England to Georgia, in which the British king, was charged with an intention of reducing the colonies to slavery, by various modes, amongst which a prominent one was recognising the rights of the Roman Catholics and favouring popery and despotism in Canada. "Now," said the Canadians, "we believe as you do, our religion to have been established by Jesus Christ, and that those good men and their forefathers, in leaving our body, made an innovation upon the unchangeable institutions of our Saviour. They com-

plain of the King of England as guilty of tyranny for observing the treaty which secures to us our religion, and which he appears disposed to observe. If it be tyranny to permit us to follow the dictates of our consciences, and that those gentlemen wish to destroy tyranny, we must give up our religion in joining their union; we prefer, sir, to abide under the government of a king who is complained of for his justice to us, than to trust to the friendship of men who tell us that we are idolaters and slaves, and dolts, and yet invite us to aid them against him whom they have abused for protecting us in our rights: neither do we forget the zeal which they manifested in hunting and shooting Father Rasles and others of our missionaries upon their borders." Thus was the aid of Canada lost by the abuse of popery; and Canada was not one whit more sensibly jealous of the honour of her religion than is South America. We love to cultivate their friendship, and we would therefore advise, for the sake of truth, of decorum, and of policy, that our common religion should not be misrepresented and insulted by our conspicuous writers.

Letters to the Very Reverend Messieurs Meyler and Yore, VV. G., of Dublin, with a Communication to the French and Irish Propagation Societies

[The letters to Messrs. Meyler and Yore, as the reader will at once perceive, were written on occasion of the establishment in Ireland of a Branch of the well-known "Society for the Propagation of the Faith;" and merely serve as an introduction to the document which follows them. This, as the reader will see from the second letter, was prepared at Rome in 1836, while the author was residing there, upon the affairs of his Haytian Mission; and was sent to the Central Council of Lyons, at whose request it was drawn up, and by whom it was translated, and first published in the French language, in the *Annales Du Prop. de la Foi.* The whole was published in the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* for 1839.]

LETTER I

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 23, 1839.

To the Very Reverend Messieurs Meyler and Yore, VV. G., Dublin.

Gentlemen:—I perceive with great satisfaction, that you have commenced in Ireland, the establishment of a society for missions, either as a branch of the excellent society created some years since in France, "for the Propagation of the Faith," or upon the same principle. It matters little which plan you may adopt.

I have long desired to see Ireland do something of the kind, and had made some efforts to procure the co-operation of that ancient and constant witness for the faith in exertions called for by the present circumstances of the world. I found, however, that as often as I strove to exert myself, I was baffled by causes not under my control; and had come to the resolution, that I would quietly confine myself to the cultivation of the extensive field in which I had been placed to labour, without occupying myself with any object beyond its limits. I was led to this determination by a variety of motives, amongst which one of the most powerful was, the belief that repeated failures of those efforts which I had begun to make, indicated the will of God that I should desist.

I had for some time acted upon this resolution, when I learned that Ireland was about to join in the generous work of aiding the remote

missions. And I felt confirmed in the opinion, that he who from the stones can raise up children to Abraham, did not need the efforts of any individual to accomplish his own wise purposes in his own good time, by the means of his own selection. I was thus strengthened in my resolution, and felt satisfied that my agency, as regarded Ireland, was unnecessary, and might be injurious; and that it was my duty to confine myself to that charge which had been specially assigned to me.

I some time afterwards received papers containing your address, from the "Central Committee for the Propagation of the Faith," established in Dublin, September 18th, 1833, and perceived that you thought my testimony valuable to show the necessity of forming and of upholding your society; it struck me, that by furnishing you with more specific details, I might be able, without departing from my resolution, to aid in the promotion of your most useful enterprise, and be a witness to our brethren in Ireland of the immense benefit conferred upon religion by the societies in France and in Germany, which have preceded yours in this zealous manifestation of charity.

For this purpose I shall, in the first instance, send you the original of a communication which I made to the Central Council at Lyons, from Rome, in the month of September, 1836, and which has been substantially translated into French under their direction, and published in No. lvii. of the *Annales,* last March. I shall in preparing this for the press, as I shall publish it in the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* make such amendments as it may seem to me to require, and should you deem it useful to have it republished in Ireland, you will thus have it ready to your hand.

I intend following up the publication of this document by that of one or two others, and giving you further details, so that you may thus have before you my views as fully as I can give them; and should you and your associates concur in them, as I trust you may, the double object may be attained, viz.,—Ireland engaged in the great work of missions, in that way which I thought would be most useful, and necessary; and I be left to continue my exertions here, confident that a work to which I once desired to devote myself will be better carried on by those better qualified for the task.

Already have the French and the German societies deserved well of the church, of religion and of civilization; already have they merited and received the gratitude and prayers of millions aided by them to walk in the paths of light and of salvation; but much still remains to be done. May you go on emulating their benevolence, their zeal, their religion, and their charity.—Should I be able to give but one suggestion that

would contribute to this end, I shall not have written in vain. Should you not find in what I transmit anything worth your attention, I shall still have satisfied my own conscience, and shall feel that however valueless my observations may be, I shall have performed what I conceive to be my duty, to those missions in which I am engaged, to those friends from whom I am separated, and to that church to which I have the happiness to belong.

It is a noble contest in which we are engaged. The same for which the Apostles of the Saviour were enlisted when they were commissioned by him to go forth and to subdue the world to the obedience of the Gospel, not by the arms of human power, but by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Fourteen centuries have passed away, since Ireland gave her allegiance to this Prince of Peace! How nobly has she adhered to it, through good and through evil report! With what a "desperate fidelity" has she adhered to the banner of the cross! And, at times, how painful was its burden!—Yet taking it up, she calmly walked, bearing it in the footsteps of him, who for our sake preceded in the rugged way of affliction. Her altars have been desecrated, her churches profaned, her children made hewers of wood and drawers of water!—They have been scattered in ignominy to the four winds of heaven, because they would not desert that way in which their Apostles led their fathers. But the sack of her afflictions has been cut away, she again is decorated with the garments of joy, and she desires to send to the wanderers who have gone forth from her shores, and to their descendants and to the stranger, a share of the blessings of which she so largely participates herself.

You have the high honour and the glorious privilege of being made the chief agents in this heavenly task. Go on then with courage and energy. You must be sustained. They that are far off will bless you, generations that are yet to rise will repeat your name; the peace of religious consolation shall enrich your souls with a serenity above the wealth of the world, and through the merits of your Saviour, you and they who unite with you will receive an hundred fold in blessings upon earth, and in eternity, the joys of Heaven.

Behold the manner in which regenerated France arises! See how religion triumphs within her borders, how piety takes possession of her people, how she is respected by the nations of the earth. May it not in the order of God's providence be a result of the prayers of those who through her means arise from the darkness in which they were involved!

So may you emulate her example and be crowned with like blessings, is the fervent prayer, dear and very reverend gentlemen, of

Your affectionate friend in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER II

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 31, 1839.

To the Very Reverend Messieurs Meyler and Yore, VV. G., Dublin.

Gentlemen:—The communication which I now send to you was written by me in Rome, in the year 1836, whilst I was waiting, in that city, for the decision of the congregation for extraordinary ecclesiastical affairs, and the direction of his holiness, respecting some propositions of which I was the bearer from the Haytian government.

On my way thither, I stayed for a very short time in Lyons, where I had the happiness to meet several esteemed friends, who were actively engaged in procuring funds for the foreign missions, and with whom I had several previous interviews in the years 1832, 1833, and 1834. On this last occasion, the question was put to me, whether the Catholic Church really gained by the emigration to the United States, from the Catholic countries in Europe.

It was not the first time that my attention was, from the same quarter, drawn to this important question: and one of the leading and most active members of the central council had conversed with me upon the subject, on two or three previous occasions.

The doubt arose from the remarks made by a clergyman in Switzerland, I believe in Friburg, I think a Mr. O'Mahony, not Irish, but evidently of Irish descent, who contended strenuously, that, so far from gaining in the United States any solid accession to her strength, the church lost many millions by the emigration.

In those conversations, we agreed that there was no question but that there was an actual increase of Catholics, and of religious establishments; but we could not come to a satisfactory conclusion, as to whether there was a gain or a loss, upon a full view of all the results of emigration.

I stated in one of those early conversations, and afterwards made the same observation in writing, that in my own diocess, which comprises the two Carolinas and Georgia, with then nearly two millions of inhabitants, I did not think that there were more than about 10,000 Roman Catholics, scattered over an area larger than France; and that I was of opinion, that from 30,000 to 50,000 of the then population, who were not Catholics, were the descendants of Catholic progenitors, who, together with their

descendants, were lost to the church, because of the absence of any institution which could preserve them in the faith.

On this latter occasion, I had examined the subject more closely, and I repeated my opinion respecting my own diocess, and added, that I believed it was not singular in this respect. The conversation naturally led to inquire for the cause and the remedy. On the eve of my departure, the secretary put into my hands a sealed letter, which he told me I could open at my leisure and answer at my convenience.

Next morning, by daybreak, I was on board a steamboat descending the Rhone with great rapidity, on my way to Avignon. Surveying my companions, I found myself in a situation by no means novel to me: knowing no person, and known by no one, though in the midst of a crowd. I took out my letter, and read it: I found it to contain a request, that I would give the council such information as I could, upon the important subject to which they had drawn my attention; and it placed the whole subject upon which information was sought under the extent of four questions.

I made very little delay at Avignon, where I arrived that evening. It had no novelty for me, as I had been twice before within its walls, and walked through its environs. I left it soon after sunset, and next day I found myself in old quarters which I had previously occupied in Marseilles. Previous to leaving this port for Leghorn, I wrote a short note to Lyons, promising that, at the first leisure moment, I would take up the subject; and the communication which I now send you, is copied by me from notes which I made in Rome, and which I somewhat enlarged, and sent from that city to Lyons, where it was translated and published in French.

In the present document, I take the liberty of making a few corrections and explanations. My object in sending it to you, is in the hope that it may more deeply interest your society in our behalf.

I remain, very reverend

And dear gentlemen,

Your affectionate friend in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

SECTION I [73]

In the letter which I received from your secretary, previously to my leaving Lyons, on the 19th of August, you gave four questions to

[73] The following communications to the Central Council for the propagation of the faith at Lyons were sent from Rome, in the month of September, 1836.

which you desired my answer; and you made some observations, in whose truth, justice, and appositeness, I fully concur.

I sent you from Marseilles a hasty and imperfect note, written under the disadvantage of my efforts to get hither with what speed I could. The important topics of your letter have, since I read it, occupied a good share of my attention; and I avail myself of the first moments that I can devote to that duty, to give, as you requested, my views upon the subject.

Your questions require, in some instances, precise details which I could not undertake to give you from this place, where the documents from which they may be furnished are not within my reach; nor do I think that I could anywhere procure exact returns, such as you desire. That, however, is matter for future consideration. From the tenor of your remarks, however, I am under the impression that you have general notions sufficiently exact to serve all your purposes.

I am led, after much reflection, to enter much more at large into the subject, than was my original intention; and in the details which I give, and the views that I take, several friends for whom I have the highest esteem may not fully concur; but I consider it to be my duty to write as I think, and should I make any erroneous statement, to give the opportunity for its correction; and if my views be erroneous, I beg of my friends to set me right.

I have been long under the impression, that not only in Europe, but even in the United States, very delusive fancies have been entertained of the progress of the Catholic Church in our Union, and even many mistakes as to the means most conducive to its propagation. I have no doubt upon my mind that, within fifty years, millions have been lost to the Catholic Church in the United States, nor do I believe that the fact has been sufficiently brought into notice, nor the proper remedies as yet applied to correct this evil. This is not the time, nor this the place to state what efforts have been made to draw attention to the mischief, and to what was thought to be a remedy; nor is it intended to insinuate by this, that there was in any quarter a want of the zeal and the devotion to religion on the part of any persons concerned, though they may differ in their views.

To any one who for a moment calmly considers the statements of your letter, nothing can be more plain than that, instead of an increase of the members naturally belonging to the Catholic Church in the United States, there has been actually a serious loss.

The question is not whether the number of Catholics in the country has actually increased; because to answer this you have only to look to

the cities, the towns, and everywhere you have the strongest and most irrefragable evidence of accession of numbers, in thousands who rise up before you. There can be no doubt of the multiplication of missions, and of priests, of the erection of churches, of the opening of colleges, of the creation of monasteries, of the amelioration of schools, of the establishing of printing presses, and of the dissemination of books, however injudiciously the publishers may have acted in several instances. I do not then mean to say that the number of Catholics is this day less than it was fifty years ago, nor as small as it was five years since; but I do assert that the loss of numbers to the Catholic Church has been exceedingly great, when we take into account the Catholic population at the time of the American Revolution, the acquisition of territory previously occupied by Catholics, the arrivals of Catholic emigrants, and the conversions to the Catholic religion.

I submit the following rough estimate as calculated to give a notion of this loss:

Fifty years ago the population of the United States was three millions: to-day it is fifteen millions. I shall suppose the natural increase of the original three to give us seven millions of our present number; this will leave us eight millions of emigrants and their descendants, together with those obtained by the acquisition of Louisiana and Florida.

On the population acquired by immigration and by cession, we may estimate at least one-half to have been Catholics: and supposing the children to have adhered to the religion of their parents, if there were no loss we should have at least four millions of Catholics from these sources, without regarding the portion which was Catholic fifty years ago, and its natural increase and the many converts and their descendants. Yet there are many who this day are well informed upon the subject of our churches, who doubt if we have one million of Catholics. Four years since my estimate was little more than half a million. Upon my first arrival in the United States, in 1820, I saw in a public document, coming from a respectable source, the estimate to be 100,000, and this favourable, and from a gentleman by no means unfriendly. I have since then made more close inquiries, taken more special notice of details, and received better information, and I think the estimate may be safely fixed at 1,200,000. This is indeed a plain and simple view, and, as you justly remarked, coincides pretty accurately in the result to which it would lead, with the estimate that I formerly gave of the number of descendants of Catholics, who in the diocess of Charleston are found in the various sects. If I say, upon the foregoing data, that we ought, if there were no loss, to have five millions of Catholics, and that we have less than one mil-

lion and a quarter, there must have been a loss of three millions and three quarters at least; and the persons so lost are found amongst the various sects to the amount of thrice the number of the Catholic population of the whole country.

I estimate the Catholics of my diocess at less than 12,000, and the descendants of Catholics in the various sects at about 38,000 or 40,000. The coincidence of the results creates a strong probability, it is indeed presumptive evidence, of the correctness of each estimate. And we may unhesitatingly assert, that the Catholic Church has, within the last fifty years, lost millions of members in the United States.

Upon every view which I can take of this subject, and during several years I have endeavoured to examine it very closely, I have been led, in a variety of places at several epochs, to special details which have been partial causes of this great and long-existing evil; but however their several causes may seem to differ, and under what peculiar circumstances soever they may have arisen, I consider they may generally be reduced to the one great head, viz.: The absence of a clergy sufficiently numerous and properly qualified for the missions of the United States.

Before I shall proceed farther, I shall try to unmask one of the most fatal errors that I have observed on this subject.

The mind of Europe has been led to undervalue the nature of the American institutions, and to look upon the society of the United States as considerably under the standard of that in Europe. So far as religion, and especially the ministry, is concerned, this mistake has not seldom led to very pernicious results. Frequently in companies, where upon most other topics I could receive great accessions to my little stock of knowledge, I have been led to doubt whether I heard correctly the very strange questions that were addressed to me respecting our laws, our manners, our society, our institutions, and our habits; I was frequently obliged to avoid enlarging upon the topics, and more than once to evade the questions, upon the very painful conviction that it would be worse than useless to give information to those who were determined not to believe. They could very readily admit all that I chose to say about Indians, huts, lakes, wild beasts, serpents, assaults, murders, and escapes, but it was out of the question that my assertions would be equally well received if I insinuated that anything in legislation, manufactures, literature or the polish of society was comparable to even what was ordinary at this side of the Atlantic.[74] In fact it would seem as if a century had rolled away, and had left America and Europe in precisely the same relative position as to improvement, as they were when

[74] The reader will recollect that this was written in Italy.

the first European adventurers undertook to stem the torrent of the Mississippi, making a tedious and exhausting effort to overcome, in six months, the obstacles of a voyage which now is little more than an excursion of a few days in a steamboat. The result of this notion was that anything was good enough for America; and the Catholic Church has frequently felt the effects of this mistake. It has more than once happened that men with acquirements and manners scarcely fit for Indians, have been deemed fit for any part of this region of Indians, and were thus inconsiderately sent into the midst of a community at least equally intelligent, and penetrating, and inquiring as any in the world!

The best way to give some correct notions upon the subject of which I treat, will be to give an historical sketch of the Catholic religion in those regions which now form the territory of the United States. That view must, of course, be general, and very rapidly taken, and, for the sake of greater accuracy, it must be divided into several epochs, according to the various changes, whether of government or of other institutions, or circumstances that affected their religious position.

These regions consist of three distinct portions. First, those places which were under Protestant dominion from the time of their discovery until the period of the American Revolution. Secondly, those places which had, up to that period, been chiefly, if not altogether, under the dominion of Catholic powers. And thirdly, that great region to the west of Missouri and the lakes, which was, and in a great measure still is, the wild domain of the Indian, who knows little of either.

SECTION II

The first portion includes the New England States, viz.: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, which form the present diocess of Boston: New York, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, Virginia, the two Carolinas, Georgia, and the greater portion of Alabama. The English and the Dutch were the original settlers of most of those regions; Great Britain may be regarded as the possessor from their colonial formation, the Dutch having held possession of New York and New Jersey only during a short period; and the principle of religious administration, as respected Catholics, having been the same under each.

The second portion embraces Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Arkansas, part of Michigan, (since this was written, Wisconsin and Iowa have been established,) Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, and a portion of Alabama. Of this extensive territory, France and Spain had possession, whether

conjointly or successively. It is unnecessary, for my present purpose, to notice the immense range of territory which stretches off westward from these states, and which forms the third division.

Before proceeding to notice the actual state of this second portion, at the several periods when its various regions passed away from the dominion of the Catholic powers, I deem it necessary to make a short statement of what I have been informed was, and in many instances continues to be, the system of France and of Spain respecting religion in those colonies. I cannot vouch for the truth of my information, and, should I have been misinformed, I shall feel very happy at having my misstatements corrected.

The policy of France was, not to permit the establishment of a bishop in her colonies, but to procure from the Holy See, that a priest should be appointed prefect apostolic, with quasi-episcopal power and detached jurisdiction, to superintend the other clergy and to administer the sacrament of confirmation. I know, from my own observation, that such is the mode of administration in most of her colonies (Algiers is an exception since this document was drawn up); and to various inquiries that I made for the reason of this policy, I was told that it was adopted in order not to embarrass the governor, by creating so high a dignitary as a bishop; and who should necessarily receive the great attention which such officers are known to pay to prelates; and not to expose bishops to the indignity that might be the consequence of any neglect of the superior colonial officers, should it be possible that any of them could so far forget what was due to religion, as to be wanting in [due] civility to the bishop. It is not my business to canvass the value of the reason alleged; but I feel quite at liberty to observe that the natural consequence of this palpable departure from the polity established by our Saviour and acted upon by the Apostles, has generally been the destruction of discipline amongst at least the secular clergy who were affected thereby: and if we are to believe one-fourth of what is generally credited respecting that discipline in the French colonies previous to 1790, this statement would be fully sustained.

I am here called upon to draw a contrast between what is known to have been the state of the Canadian colony, in which there was a bishop established at Quebec, and those places which were administered by prefects apostolic. In Canada, religion was respectably sustained, the faith preserved, discipline flourished: a clergy was maintained and perpetuated; and an edifying body of priests and people continued firmly attached to their ancient institutions, and virtuously fulfilling

their duties, even under a government hostile to their faith, and using its best efforts to undermine their religion.

Justice also obliges me to testify, that from what I have seen and learned in Guadaloupe, during a short visit to that island in 1833, I found that, notwithstanding the defects of the system, the excellent prefect and his clergy were meritoriously regular and zealous, and that religion had proper respect from the sensible and judicious governor of that colony.

Not only is this system calculated to do a serious injury to discipline, but in some colonies the priests are at so great a distance from their superior, as to be seldom, if ever under his supervision. In many instances, a great portion of the colonists are persons, who not being able conveniently to remain in the mother country, repair to those distant settlements to escape inconvenience, or to retrieve their fortune. They are not, then, the most healthy portion of the moral population; and amongst such a people, it is no ready task for a clergyman, under the most favourable circumstances, to make great progress in the work of reformation, or to preserve himself unstained.

Spain had not that semblance of respect for the episcopal character, which would prevent her having bishops established in her colonies: but they were necessarily few, and very distant; and though numbers of them are said to have been excellent men, yet it was believed that several others were persons whom the government that presented them did not like to set aside from promotion, but did not wish to see wearing mitres in Europe. It is also said that in many instances, in the French as in the Spanish colonies, priests that would not be tolerated in the mother country, forced their way into places for which they were by no means qualified. Thus, in those regions where the clergy wanted most rigid superintendence, there was the least efficient discipline. This may perhaps account for the situation in which the churches of Louisiana and Florida were at the period of their cession to the United States. To my own knowledge, there was in Florida but one single efficient priest, who, not liking the change, retired to Cuba, and subsequently to Ireland, of which he was a native. I have heard nearly a similar account of Louisiana; so that when they were transferred to the United States, those regions contained an uninstructed and neglected population professing the Catholic religion, without Catholic customs or religious knowledge, nearly bereft of a Catholic clergy. A large portion of this mass consisted of negro slaves.

In no country where slavery exists was there, I believe, a better system of legal provisions for the religious and moral cultivation of this

class, than in the Spanish possessions: nor do I think there could be generally speaking, a better mode devised for preventing some of the worst consequences to morality and religion, which are unfortunately almost inseparable from slavery in the colonies, than that which Spain had adopted, perhaps devised. This, however, was for many years a dead letter in the places of which I write, whilst under the latter days of Spanish dominion, and under the occasional possession by France, neither the legal provisions, nor the moral system, nor any substitute for either was in existence. These considerations, taken together with the former remarks, will enable the readers of this communication to form some opinion of what sort of Catholic population was acquired to the United States by the cession of Louisiana and of Florida; and no sooner did they become portions of this country, than all religious denominations and preachers of all opinions poured rapidly into those places, where larger bodies of untouched land offered the hope of greater returns for their industry.

Long previous to the American Revolution, whilst Britain yet held our states as colonies, Canada was ceded by capitulation to the crown of England. At that period, the Catholic missionaries had their congregations upon the Wabash, the Illinois and other places which form the states of Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois. The red man, induced to leave the superstition and the idolatry of his fathers, worshipped God in spirit and in truth, partaking of the sacraments of our Redeemer with full faith, humble confidence, and tender piety; but, soon after this transfer was effected, the missionary was obstructed, and the children of the forest, yet tenacious of their creed, wept by the side of the father of rivers, and mingled their lamentations with the wailings of the wind, upon witnessing the desolation of their rude but venerated altars. The axe of the backwoodsman has felled the forest, the bounding deer has migrated towards the setting sun, the ploughshare has furrowed the surface of the land, cities have arisen, the power of steam has overcome the resistance of the waters, the bones of the ancient worshippers have mouldered into dust, but still Kaskaskia and many a similar spot exhibit to us the ruins of those early Christian schools, where the Ottawa and the Illinois, and the Pottowattomie exchanged their wampum, and smoked their calumet and buried their hatchet; whilst their eyes shed unwonted tears at the recital of the sorrows of the Son of God. England became the mistress of these lands, [and] caused the Christian sacrifice to be taken away. The Revolution soon followed; and the American eagle, whilst he rose in the vigour of youth and the joy of

victory, beheld no Catholic worship in the regions which oppression, strife, and war had now made desolate.

The mighty wilderness was left to become the habitation of successive emigrants from the East, who have produced the mighty changes to which I have alluded.

SECTION III

I have now to draw your attention to those places, which, from their original settlement, were under Protestant domination. They are to be considered as seriously differing from each other in a religious point of view. New England was settled, it is true, under English authority and by the English Protestants, but they were not of the English Church; they were the Puritans, who complained that "the Reformation," as it is fashionable amongst some to call the great religious defection of the 16th century, was by no means sufficiently perfect in England; they complained that several doctrines that were anti-scriptural were retained in the established Protestant religion of that country, and that very many of its usages and ceremonies were superstitious and anti-christian and idolatrous. They were driven from England by Protestant persecution, after a sojourn in Holland, where they looked for more congenial opinions; they felt, even there, great disappointments, and then set out for this new world, to colonize a region which they had procured from the British crown, and for the occupation of which they made some settlement with the Indians.

The Puritans were inimical to the Church of England, and they would not permit those who differed from them in religious opinions to remain in their colony; and as differences of this description, necessarily must arise amongst all those who adopt the principle of individual inalienable right to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, they had in process of time, their differences, their persecutions and separations into various colonies, but all agreed in a common determination of not tolerating Catholics. We may say the same of their Dutch neighbours, who settled in New Amsterdam, now called New York, and in a part of New Jersey, and when the English succeeded the Dutch in their dominion over those regions, they unflinchingly adhered to the same principle.

Virginia was a common name at that period to the entire region which comprises not only that state, but also, the Carolinas and the entire of the then known wilderness stretching away to the west, and going south to the unascertained boundaries of what was called Florida. In this region, the settlers professed the religion of the English Protestant

established Church, and embodied in their infancy, in their code, all the ferocious laws of England against the Catholics. A spirit of mutual animosity and a practice of mutual persecution, caused New England and Virginia, though colonized from the same country, to cherish animosity and rancorous dislike to each other.

Meantime, a small body of the English Catholics, with whom a few Irish of the same religion associated, accompanied Lord Baltimore, who, because he was a Catholic, was obliged to leave his country. They settled in Maryland, upon the lands of which he had obtained a grant, and for governing the colony of which he had a charter. This little Catholic society made perfect religious liberty for every Christian the basis of their legislation, and were the first who gave the example of establishing religious freedom at this side of the Atlantic. After various efforts of the Virginians for their ruin or expulsion, they were permitted to remain in peace. In a short time the colony became prosperous, and the Virginian dissenter, and the New England Protestant Episcopalian, flying from the persecution with which each worried the other, were hospitably received by the Marylander, and not only protected in their civil rights, but admitted to a full participation of political power; and it was thus that Maryland, Catholic Maryland at that time, led the way to the temple of religious liberty and to the concord of brethren.

Very soon after this, a number of Quakers accompanied William Penn to the colony which he undertook to establish between Maryland and New Jersey. On this new settlement, there was no law to punish any man for his religious opinions; but it was not till after a considerable lapse of time that any Catholic had settled there.

The revolution which took place in England, in 1641, having placed the Presbyterians and other Calvinists in power, its influence extended to the colonies: and within less than a quarter of a century from the period of their arrival, the Catholics of Maryland found themselves deprived of their civil, religious and political rights, and overwhelmed by a band of strangers who, flying from each others' cruelty, were received into this asylum of Christian charity, and they now united to oppress and to persecute the Catholics who had given them a shelter and a home. The laws which were passed subsequently in England against Catholics under Charles the Second, and by which they were stripped of most of the remnant which they held after the tyrannical persecution of the cruel Elizabeth, and of the cold-blooded, hypocritical pedant James I., as well as the robberies of the succeeding period, now were made of force in the colonies, and vigorously carried into effect.

Nor did the new legislators of Maryland deem the subsequent barbarous additions made under the heartless Anne sufficient: they devised and introduced others, as if to show their greater ingenuity in adding the last affliction which could perfect the malice of the British enactments.

Probably it will not be amiss, here, to advert a little to the character of one of those laws which, to the ordinary reader, would not otherwise appear in their true position, and which, by reason of unfortunate prejudices, are not fully appreciated by all who peruse them. They appear to be laws merely relating to Irish servants arriving in the colony; their true nature can be known only by looking into the history of Ireland itself, that we may there learn who these servants were; nor will this be without an important bearing upon what regards, this day, the missions of the United States, and perhaps of many other distant regions.

It is notorious, that when in the excess of his rage, and filled with the spirit of revenge, Henry VIII. of England, compelled his Parliaments to legalize his innovations in religion, very little was effected in Ireland. Numbers of old and settled families in such parts of that country as acknowledged its subjection to the English crown were firmly attached to their religion. They, together with the whole body of the Irish that yet preserved their independence, continued steadfast adherents to the Catholic Church. Upon the accession of Elizabeth, her interest, as well as her pride, forced her to separate England from the Holy See, (Rome could not acknowledge the right of heirship in the issue of a notorious adultery.) Her father's imperious spirit dwelt fully and powerfully in her soul, and her Parliaments were her crouching slaves. Secure of England, she sought to complete the conquest of Ireland, not only by reducing to her obedience that portion which was not as yet under her dominion, but also by forcing her newly made religion upon all inhabitants. The descendants of the ancient Irish and English settlers were alike ordered to lay aside the religion of their fathers, and to practise that which the Queen had framed. Many of the Irish chieftains were unwilling to bend their necks to the yoke, and the whole body of the people refused to give up their faith, or to forsake their altars. The history of her partial success is an account of perfidy, of famine, of blood, and of wo. Confiscation of their lands, loss of their titles, beggary, exile or death were the portion allotted to those who remained faithful to their God. The tragedies enacted by her cruel officers scarcely find a parallel. Yet did not her power extend as far as her malevolence.

James I. succeeded to her throne, and without the abilities of Eliza-

beth, he pursued the path which she had opened. For Ireland he was a disastrous despot. Whole provinces were made desolate and colonies of Presbyterians were introduced from Scotland to occupy those lands from which the Irish Catholics had been swept with a besom of desolation. They are the "Scotch Irish." Charles I. succeeded to James, and with increased ruin to the desolated land. Europe was appalled at the horrors that had been perpetrated, and looked with execration on the authors of the calamities of this devoted country. The oppressors, in order to create some semblance of excuse, added calumny to their other crimes, and that the world might be induced to imagine that there was some justifying ground for their cruelty, the Irish nation was said to be stupid, cruel, barbarous, ignorant and intractable: every bad quality was imputed to them, merely because they were faithful to their religion, and tenacious of their property and their rights. It is indeed true that it could soon be truly said that they were poor, because they were plundered; and they were then called a beggarly rabble. Still the fastnesses of the country offered an asylum to a few of the ancient princes of the land and their impoverished adherents, who were thus forced into the semblance of outlawed brigands.

England had lost her hierarchy. Ireland saw her cathedrals and her other church property in the hands of men intruded by force, and protected by armies of mercenaries, who vituperated and blasphemed that religion for whose service those cathedrals were erected and that property consecrated. Though she could not save the temporalities of her prelates from the grasp of their persecutors, nor always protect themselves from assassination or prison, yet she preserved their succession. It is well known that many suffered martyrdom and multitudes made glorious confessions of their faith; but their fidelity to heaven was made treason to the government. "This man is no friend to Cæsar;" and the Catholic clergy were from that day to the present denounced by the sycophants of their oppressors, and by their dupes and their tools, as agitators and conspirators, plotting and exciting the people to sedition.

Cromwell sprung from the scaffold of the unfortunate persecutor, who is ludicrously styled in the English liturgy, King Charles the Martyr, to the denomination which is called a protectorate; and with him fanaticism, hypocrisy, and rapine, enjoyed their day of triumph. His myrmidons overran Ireland, penetrated to almost all its recesses, despoiling most of those who had escaped former plunderers, and stripping even those who, under the Tudor and the Stuart, had been enriched by the robbery of the Catholic. A more mean and voracious horde was never poured upon any other region, than were the soldiers of this revolution-

ary English army, who now were put into possession of a large bulk of the land of Ireland; and to these the unfortunate Irish Catholics were made hewers of wood and drawers of water. This epoch in Ireland corresponds with that of the plunder of the Catholics of Maryland, by authority of the same power that raised to possession of the wealth of Ireland the gang of unprincipled adventurers who overspread that country. I do not recollect more than two branches of any respectable Irish families that have preserved any of their property by apostacy: these are a younger branch of the O'Neills, in the North, now decorated with an English title, and one sept of the O'Briens, at the South, now known by the title of Thomond, but better known in Irish by the appellation of Totane, from the incendiarism and plunder of some monasteries. If there were any others, they were not worthy of notice.

It is human nature, that they who by such a process get into elevated situations should strive to make the world believe that the persons, into whose places they have made their way, were not worthy to hold them. This horde rose into wealth and power upon the principle of abolishing nobility and title of distinction, as incompatible with the laws of God and the rights of man. Upon the restoration of Charles II. to the British throne, they changed sides in order to secure their possessions; and they made interest at court by the most perfect obsequiousness, and often by the meanest servility, to procure titles of nobility; and in process of time their children became the most conspicious members of the peerage of Ireland.

The next blow which the Irish Catholics received was, when upon the flight of the unfortunate James II., they capitulated and received William and Mary as their sovereigns, upon the condition of enjoying religious liberty. Previous to this, the troops of William were arrested at the walls of Limerick; the unaided Irish forces rendered the issue of the contest exceedingly doubtful. The English and Dutch commanders were privately instructed to come to any arrangement that would not be greatly mischievous or dishonourable, and the treaty was drawn up, but the articles were not yet subscribed, when the Catholics were informed that the fleet of France, with abundant aid, was at the mouth of the Shannon; and they urged to withhold their signatures. They answered, that though their names had not been affixed, their consent had been given, and their honour was engaged.

They trusted to the faith and the honour of a King: they were doomed to feel the scourging of a Parliament chiefly composed of the Cromwellian gentry, and finding that instead of the liberty which they expected upon the faith of their contract, they were doomed to undergo

more tyranny than even theretofore, they abandoned themselves to despair; and multitudes of them quitted, with tears of sorrow and of indignation, the land of their fathers.

Many of those exiles for their faith were hospitably received by the Kings of France and of Spain, and by the Catholic powers of Germany. Some of the most ancient and respectable families in Europe have at this day the blood of those men flowing in their veins. Some of those hapless, but voluntary exiles wandered across the Atlantic: they had heard of a Catholic settlement in Maryland, and they knew not the history of that perfidy which destroyed the principles of its establishment. They cherished the hope that upon a foreign shore they would not meet that contumely and that oppression which were their portion at home. Several of those whose ancestors had enjoyed princely domains during centuries, sought to sustain themselves by laborious industry: of these some engaged, as a compensation for their passage, to work in the new country for a stipulated time at a rate lower than the usual wages. They were thus to redeem their debt by a limited servitude, and were called Irish redemptioners, or Irish servants. The laws, now enacted in Ireland, inflicted banishment to a colony and service therein, as a penalty for the crime of practising many duties of the Catholic religion, and the persons transported under those laws were also known as Irish servants.

At the period of which I write negroes were imported from Africa into the British colonies, and a tax was exacted for each slave upon the importer. The legislative body of Maryland of that day stands, I believe, alone and dishonourably conspicious for having, amongst its other enactments of persecution, sought to degrade still lower the confessor of the faith, by imposing exactly the same tax upon the introduction of an Irish servant and the importation of a negro slave! ! ! The Irish Catholic, however, did not find this to be altogether a novelty; for the Protestant Parliament of the land that he left had set exactly the same price upon the head of a friar and the head of a wolf, when it sought the extirmination of both! Yet there was this notable difference made by the American law between the Africans and the Irish: the negro slave was subject to no penalty for practising the idolatry of his father's land, while the statute-book was filled with enactments to punish the Irish servant or freeman, if he ventured to worship God with those Christian rites which St. Patrick had peaceably established when he preached the doctrine of the Redeemer in the "Emerald Isle." Thus the negro, though a slave, had that religious freedom which was denied to the Irish Catholic, even if he should be free.

Not only, then, did the Irish Catholic find all the laws of persecution, under which he was tortured at home in that land, upon entering which he was degraded and taxed, but even many vexations were superadded.

Without some knowledge of this portion of history, it is impossible to explain, properly, the difficulties which have retarded the progress of the Catholic religion in the United States. The true key to the explanation of many of these difficulties, which bewilder the unobserving, is to be found in a history which is overlooked or undervalued. No one will venture to assert that a generation is unaffected by the position of that which preceded it: and the vast majority of the Catholic population of the United States are descendants of those men, of whose struggles at home for the preservation of their religion and the defence of their country, I have endeavoured to trace an outline. England has, unfortunately, too well succeeded in linking contumely to their name in all her colonies; and though the United States have cast away the yoke under which she held them, many other causes combined to continue against the Irish Catholic, more or less, to the present day, the sneer of the supercilious, the contempt of the conceited, and the dull prosing of those who imagine themselves wise. That which more than a century of fashion has made habitual, is not to be overcome in a year, and to any Irish Catholic who has dwelt in this country during one-fourth of the period of my sojourn, it will be painfully plain that, although the evil is slowly diminishing, its influence is not confined to the American nor to the anti-Catholic. When a race is once degraded, however unjustly, it is a weakness of our nature that, however we may be identified with them upon some points, we are desirous of showing that the similitude is not complete. You may be an Irishman but not a Catholic; you may be Catholic but not Irish; it is clear you are not an Irish Catholic in either case! ! ! But when the great majority of the Catholics of the United States were either Irish or of Irish descent, the force of the prejudice against the Irish Catholic bore against the Catholic religion in the United States: and the influence of this prejudice has been far more mischievous than is generally believed.

SECTION IV

Thus, they who know anything of American history will perceive, that nothing can be more erroneous than the notion, that, at the period of our revolution, Maryland was a Catholic settlement. The descendants of Lord Baltimore had abandoned their religion, and the great bulk of

the population at the period of the Declaration of Independence was Protestant of one denomination or other. A few, and but a very few of the Catholic families had preserved their religion, and a portion of their property: and some of the Irish servants, as they were called, adhered to the creed of their fathers; few of them, however, had been able to have recourse to its ministry, and still more few to transmit it to their descendants. The difficulty of obtaining the aid of the ministry was, in mose places, exceedingly great, because the clergy being the special objects of the persecuting code, and being very few, they were generally concealed from the zealots who hunted after them for bigotry, and the irreligious who chased them for mere wantonness and sport.

Upon a general principle, which however correct in theory, yet is frequently found to work mischievously in practice, as these were colonies of Great Britain, they were considered to be in charge of the vicar-apostolic of the London district, when such a prelate had been established, and this dignitary being himself surrounded by difficulties, exposed to persecution and unable to aid them, was just as little likely to know their wants or have power to apply remedies to their evils, as was the Khan of Tartary.

Such was the situation of what began as a Catholic colony under the auspices of the crown of Great Britain, and with the promise of royal protection. Such were the returns made by their Protestant neighbours to those Catholics who first established religious liberty upon the shores of America. This is but a faint outline of the misconduct of that party which taunts Catholics with bigotry, and illiberality, and which boasts of the great edifice of civil and religious freedom, which they allege, was raised in our republics by the genius of Protestantism! Such is an imperfect sketch of the way, in which their wealth was obtained by the progenitors of those men who reproach the Irish and the American Catholics with their poverty? I shall add but one other detail to the recital. In doing so, I shall exhibit another way in which the wealth of several of the Irish nobility and landed gentry has been accumulated; nor is America altogether free from the taint.

Some of the Irish, and a few of the American Catholics sought, through the friendship and honour of their Protestant neighbours, to preserve at the same time their property and their faith. They gave absolute titles of their lands, by a legal transfer, to their Protestant friends, who undertook privately, by a pledge of honour, which was all they could give, that whilst their ostensible ownership covered it from confiscation and rapine, they would administer it for the benefit of the Catholic family that confided in their friendship, and would reconvey

it to the proper owners by sufficient titles, when the law should permit Catholics to become proprietors. Several Protestants have honourably fulfilled this sacred trust, and have thus saved much for the victims of the law, if the outrageous robbery which they sanctioned, be not a desecration of the name of law:—but, for others, the temptation was too great to be resisted: and many a high-headed, titled and domineering Irish persecutor this day holds the wealth of which he boasts, by title thus infamously transmitted. This vile code, also, gave at once to the child of any Catholic, who at any age should apostatize, the whole real property of the family, to the exclusion of the parents and of the other children, and Protestant trustees were to be appointed to hold it for him, until he arrived at the age of twenty-one years.

Nor was this all. Even personal property was subjected, in a variety of ways, to plunder. Perhaps one anecdote will be a sufficient specimen of the system. I shall relate it, as I heard it from the late venerable Bishop of Cork, Doctor Moylan, who died in 1815. It occurred in his boyhood, and is highly creditable to the Protestant Bishop Browne, of Cork, at the time when this system of robbery was in full force. I am not certain, whether it was not Timothy McCarthy (called Rabagh, or, as a lane, where he lived in obscure retreat, is now called Rawbuck, by mistake,) was the then Bishop of Cork, or his successor, Bishop Walsh. By the aid of some of his flock he procured two horses, to enable him to make the visitation of his diocess, accompanied by one of his priests, or to fly from his pursuers, as the case might require. The law forbade any Catholic to possess a horse of the value of more than £5, and authorized any Protestant, upon the payment of five pounds, to take away, for himself, any horse that a Catholic owned. A person called on the Bishop to inform him that his horses would probably be demanded under this law: their value was more than six times the amount. Whilst they were yet devising how to save the horses, an agent from the Protestant bishop entered, paid down ten pounds, demanded the horses, insisted upon their delivery, and carried them away; in a short time afterwards, another similar demand was made, but the horses were no longer there. A note was soon received from the Protestant bishop, informing the Catholic prelate, that being quite aware of the determination of several Protestants to secure for themselves the horses, under the provisions of the law, he had sent early to secure them for himself, and having taken them into his possession, he now sent them back to their former owner as a loan to be kept and used until they should be sent for. This was not the only instance in which the benevolence of even dignitaries of the Protestant Church mitigated the pro-

visions of this atrocious code. In America, equally as in Ireland, were the Catholics emaciated in numbers and in poverty by its operation; and thus Maryland was made one of those colonies in which, though some Catholics were left, still the spirit of hostility to Catholics was made most manifest. And in Maryland, as in Ireland, if we find evidence of Protestant cruelty and oppression, we also find many noble instances of Protestant generosity, of Protestant friendship, and of Protestant protection.

I have mentioned Pennsylvania as a colony, in which no laws were enacted to restrain religious freedom. Its legislature adhered to this principle, and, as it bordered upon Maryland, when the persecution became vigorous in this colony, several Catholics retired from Maryland into Pennsylvania, but they had scarcely any opportunity of seeing a priest, nor was the term "religious liberty" sufficiently understood by the Quakers to comprehend Catholicity. It is true, that they neither hanged, whipped, banished nor fined the members of our church for their faith, nor did they tax them as Irish servants; but there is that solemn, distant, cold, systematic avoidance which proclaims, in a way sufficiently intelligible, the dislike and condemnation which one avoids to express by words. I know of no better description of this conduct, than is contained in a common story told of a Quaker's conduct to a dog which he disliked. Looking at him as he saw some persons approach, he thus soliloquized, "I shall neither hang thee, nor shoot thee, nor strike thee, but I shall call thee by a name," and as the people were within hearing, he exclaimed "Mad dog!" The unfortunate amimal was pursued by the crowd and stoned to death, whilst the man who gave the name stood by, expressing his compassion for the suffering dog, and subsequently lectured the crowd for their cruelty to dumb beasts. I do not by any means seek to convey by this repetition of a common story my notion of the character of the "Society of Friends," amongst whom, I have met several of the most benevolent individuals and kindest benefactors; but I give it as descriptive of what I do consider to have been the conduct of Pennsylvania towards the Catholics. And I shall give one instance as a sample of the facts, upon which I have come to my conclusion.

About a century since, a few Catholics in Philadelphia wished to erect a small chapel in an obscure corner of the city. No difficulty had, I believe, ever been raised to obstruct any of the several sectaries that were spread through the colony; but it was deemed necessary by those who then ruled, to send for advice upon the subject to the Privy Council in London. It was asked, as no law existed to prohibit them in the

colony of Pennsylvania, yet as this people was everywhere contradicted, would it be proper to permit their raising this edifice? The spirit of the answer corresponded with that of the application. There is no legal power, it said, to prevent the Catholics doing as they desire, but it is the wish of the council that as many difficulties as possible shall be raised. And as the obedient rulers of the colony did not wish to incur the displeasure of their British masters, it is unnecessary to remark, that difficulties and perplexity, and delays were not wanting. This suffices to show the situation of the Catholics in Pennsylvania; and everywhere else there was positive, direct exclusion of anything Catholic. After the perusal of these details, the reader will be better prepared to judge of the difficulties experienced by Irish Catholics emigrating to these colonies.

Previous to 1776, few Irish Catholics settled in any of the colonies except Maryland and Pennsylvania; some Irish servants had been transported to Virginia, and a number of German Catholics had located themselves in Pennsylvania. But the want of the clergy was so great, that no priest was to be met with in more than three or four spots of this extensive region: thus deprived of all spiritual aid, separated from their former associates, estranged from their kindred, mingled amongst sectaries, accustomed to hear their religion misrepresented, and its professors vilified and abused, and seeing no prospect of being able to resume its practices, great numbers of these persons made no profession of their faith; they were gradually drawn to attend the preaching and prayers of the sects; they intermarried with the members of these strange churches; their children, frequently unconscious of the religion of the parent, were educated in direct hostility to its tenets and its practices; so that, in fact, the descendants of far the greater portion of those Catholics who emigrated to the British American colonies, are now not only sectaries, but many of them the most virulent opponents of the church of their ancestors. Notwithstanding these obstacles, it is said, and I believe upon good grounds, that the greater portion of the regular troops furnished by Pennsylvania during the revolutionary war, from 1776 to 1783—or, as they are called, the Pennsylvania line—were Irish Catholics. This shows that, though the loss of the Catholic Church was exceedingly great, by reason of the various causes to which I have alluded, yet that at the period of the revolution there was in the country a good number of Catholics, a considerable portion of whom, at least more than one-third, were natives of Ireland.

The success of the revolutionary army established a new state of society; gradually the laws of persecution were torn away from the statute-books of most of the new republics; but however favourable

this may be, it could not supply a clergy, nor abolish long-standing and deep-rooted prejudices, which had been sedulously nourished by continued misrepresentations. And even after the Revolution, years had passed away before several of the states could be induced to repeal the British laws against the Catholics. It is only last year that North Carolina has placed them on an equality with her other citizens; and New Jersey has still a foul blot on her constitution.

It is now necessary, before coming to view the state of religion after the American Revolution, to cast an eye back to a few of the consequences of the transfer of Canada.

We may consider Canada as consisting of some of that portion which is now called Lower, and which extends from Montreal to Quebec, on both sides of the river St. Lawrence, and thence to the mouth of that river, for little more was then settled. We may look upon the rest of Lower Canada, and of what is now called the upper province and all the western territory, together with what is now called New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, as at that period of little or no importance. All this vast region, which was transferred by France to England, together with Canada, at the capitulation of Quebec, I shall consider as an out-territory.

During the French administration, Canada was managed in its religious concerns, generally, with great prudence and great zeal. A bishopric was established at Quebec: parishes were formed, organized, and provided with a good and useful clergy, who spoke the same language, who had the same origin, and the same manners and habits with the colonists. Seminaries for the education of the clergy, colleges for the laity, and convents and schools for the instruction of female children, were erected and endowed; hospitals and other charitable institutions were provided. All had the most perfect analogy to the bulk of the settlers, so far as regarded language, manners, habits, and religion. Everything was prosperous. Jesuits and other qualified missionaries made occasional settlements amongst the Indians, in the out-territory.

The government of England was hostile to the religion of the people. We have seen how violent were the prejudices, and how cruel the laws of the colonies to the south. So that, although by the articles of cession much had been secured by France for the protection of the religion of the new subjects of the British crown, yet they were exposed to great dangers. The successive English governors of Canada received the most precise and insidious private instructions from the English Privy Council, to undermine the Catholic religion in this newly acquired colony, for the purpose of making the English Protestant form

of religion dominant and established; but, though the clergy and their faithful flocks, and the interests of religion suffered seriously, yet were all efforts of this description fruitless, and Canada continued faithful to her God and to his church.

The English government was, by its very position, forced to do homage to that religion which it wished to destroy; and it was no time to come to a rupture with the Canadians, when the old colonies were making complaints and presenting demands, after petition had been found unavailing. England, then, yielding to the dictates of good sense and sound policy, began to act with more moderation in her opposition to the religious feelings of her Canadian subjects; and she reaped the benefit of her change of conduct, whilst the bigotry and intolerance of some of her revolting colonies materially aided to secure to her the co-operation and fidelity of this newly acquired and important Catholic settlement.

Amongst the various complaints made by the thirteen colonies which subsequently became the United States, many were of great weight and manifest justice; but others were palpably unfounded, some frivolous. One of the most conspicuous of these latter was the charge put forth by some of the colonies in their list of grievances, that the King of Great Britain was a tyrant, because he sought to destroy the liberties of the other colonies, and to introduce despotism, by favouring and sustaining, some of them went so far as to say, by tolerating Popery in Canada. They all appeared to use it as a ground for urging against this monarch their charge of a deliberate attempt to destroy their liberties. And yet, notwithstanding this act of so astonishing a character, the Congress of the United States actually sent a delegation in which there was a Catholic, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and which, upon the suggestion of Franklin, one of its members, was accompanied by a Catholic priest, the Rev. John Carroll, a Jesuit, and subsequently the first Bishop and first Archbishop of the Catholic Church in the United States, to ask the Canadians to join in their revolution!!! It is not surprising that they could not succeed. I have my information from the lips of Charles Carroll. Canada had seen, she had heard enough. Canada had not forgotten the martyrdom of Father Sebastian Rasles, whom some of the soldiers of Massachusetts had murdered, in the midst of his congregation of Indians, on the 23d of August, 1724, and whose dead body they treated with even worse indignity than Buzzell and his mob treated the bodies at Mount Benedict, [more] than a century afterwards. Canada recollected many similar acts of kindness, received in like manner from the colonists of New England. This is sufficient to show the spirit which

then pervaded the land. And we surely should consider the Canadians as the most besotted of all beings, were they prevailed upon to give up the protection which England began to afford, in order to make common cause with the colonies, which, whatever their own grievances might have been, complained that conduct far different from such protection was tyranny to them. As Great Britain herself was led by her fears and her necessities to relax her persecution, so too, the United States forgot the tyranny of tolerating the Catholic religion, in their fear that without Canadian aid they might not be successful. And the lessons thus taught have since been improved upon: considerable progress has been made within sixty years!

The Catholics had many missions in the out-territory amongst the Indians, several of whom had been united to the church, and whose conduct was edifying. The Jesuits had been principally engaged in this apostolic duty, and they had large funds applicable to this purpose, besides those necessary for the maintenance of their own institutions. The British gradually had sent the Jesuits from those missions, seized upon their funds and buildings, and threw back the whole of this immense range of country, if I may so express it, into its original desolation; and thus, that portion of it to the west, which came into the possession of the United States—though formerly, as we have seen, occupied by missionaries—was, at the period of the Revolution, totally without religious opportunities, nor has it since been practicable to make any extensive efforts to seek after and to instruct those red descendants of the first fervent Christian converts. Some of them, it is true, are now again gathered into a few congregations upon the British possessions; others have wandered through the western forests towards the Pacific.

Amongst the most wealthy and respectable colonists of the South, were many families of Huguenots, whom England received upon the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and whom she placed in a region where, by their industry and perseverance, they had acquired for their descendants wealth and power. It was natural that they should entertain and cherish prejudices against that religion from which, they had been taught, their fathers had suffered much; but justice requires the avowal that they have never manifested a spirit of persecution. At the period to which we have now arrived, there was scarcely a Catholic to be found in the whole extent of the Carolinas or Georgia, nor was there a priest in this region for many years after the revolution. Great numbers of the Presbyterians, who were invited to settle in Carolina, were the descendants of those Scotch settlers who had been planted, as I before described, in the north of Ireland, upon the extermination of the Irish

Catholics under Elizabeth and James I. Several large settlements had also been made directly from Scotland; and an extensive body of the land was occupied by German Protestants, and a few of the same religion from Switzerland. Still the great landed proprietors were of English or of French descent.

SECTION V

This brings us to the period when the territory ceased to be under the government of England, and when, by a treaty of peace with that power, the independence of the United States was fully and formally recognised. It is obvious, that up to this period, the number of Catholics must have been considerably less than what it would have been, had there existed a sufficient clergy and no persecution. It is at this moment very difficult to say what was the number of Catholics, but I think the clergy would be numbered very fully in putting it down at twenty-five. Indeed, I consider this as overrating it. Many causes now combined to diminish the long-existing prejudices: not only had Catholics fought and fallen in the revolutionary struggle, but Catholic France had aided with her army and her navy; her Catholic chaplains had celebrated our offices in the camps and in the cities; Catholic Poles had fought by the side of the American soldiers, had led their troops into the thickest of the fight, and had sacrificed their lives for the cause of American freedom; the best and most gallant and hardy portion of their own troops, the Pennsylvania line, was chiefly composed of Irish Catholics. The commander-in-chief, the noble and generous Washington, had testified to their bravery and their devotion. A Catholic was the man who probably had staked the largest property in their cause, amongst that patriot band that had pledged life and fortune and sacred honour to sustain the Declaration of Independence. He had gone with Franklin and another, accompanied by a Catholic priest, through pathless woods and unexplored mountains, a long and perilous journey, to try whether they could wipe away from the mind of the Catholic colony of Canada the unfavourable impressions which the ignorance, the folly, and the bigotry of those hostile to his creed, had made, to the detriment of his country. The feelings of hostility to Catholics, and the prejudices against our religion thus began, at the period of the Revolution, gradually to decline, liberty of worship soon was restored in some of the states, penalties were blotted from the statute-book; yet was the public mind quite uninformed respecting our tenets and our principles; the ancient notions respecting

Catholic doctrines and practices continued to subsist, though feelings of kindness began to be entertained.

Probably this would have been an exceedingly favourable moment to have taken advantage of such a disposition; but to do so would require a body of clergymen well-informed, prudent, and far more numerous than existed in the States. Just prejudices, if I may use the expression, were entertained against Great Britain, so that if England had had priests to spare, it is doubtful how far they would have been acceptable. That nation so far as regarded our religion, was then in a very different position from that which she at present occupies, though even now, she cannot furnish a clergy sufficient for her own demands, and the late vicar-apostolic of the London district, not long since remarked in answer to official inquiries, that it was impossible to foresee the period when England would be likely to furnish priests for her own colonies. At the time of which I treat, her few clergy were ground down under an afflicting persecution, she had no place in the kingdom for the education of her candidates, and was of course totally unable to do anything for America. Ireland was in a still worse position; yet the loss of the American colonies created in Great Britain a wholesome dread which too far exasperated the plundered population of this ill-treated land. In order to try and secure their attachment, during the war with France and the contest with the revolutionary colonies, the government of Ireland had considerably mitigated the ferocity of its persecution. The Irish Catholics wanted a good many priests and were very insufficiently supplied. As this island had no seminary within her borders, she was dependent upon those which the Catholic nations of Europe, especially France, had allowed to be opened upon their soil for the education of her zealous youth, who, in defiance of the prohibitions of those in power, ventured at the risk of their vengeance, to leave their country by stealth for that purpose, and to return in the face of every peril to serve upon the mission. Little of course could be then done by Ireland for America.

The language of the Catholic nations being so different from the English tongue, which was that of the United States, and the almost impossibility for a foreigner to acquire it, in such a way, as to be a useful public speaker, left little inducement for zealous missionaries from the continent of Europe to enter upon these missions. There existed also other obstacles of no little moment, which rendered it unlikely that European priests could at that moment be usefully invited. The political principles of Europe and the vague notions which existed in regard to the revolution and the republicanism of the new states, were undefined and unsatisfactory; the manners and the habits of the Europeans

were different from those of the Americans; the contemplation of those differences, added to that of the immense distance at which the great Atlantic then seemed to place the two hemispheres, the infrequency of communication, and a variety of similar difficulties, left little prospect of success as the result of any application. There was another obstacle, arising from the poverty of the Catholics as a body and the almost total absence of any funds, save what could be obtained from their generosity; the sole exception was, some property which had been originally destined for the missions that were served in early times by the Jesuits, and a portion of which had by a variety of contrivances been preserved, and which had at this period been legally vested in the priests of Maryland, who had been incorporated by the new government; and which has since insensibly passed into the possession of the Jesuits of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, upon the condition of paying something towards the support of the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore. It was from this fund that the clergy then derived the principal means for their support.

Thus, though the Catholics were now spread in greater or less numbers through the States, there were no clergymen save in Maryland and in Pennsylvania, and these were too few for the number who sought the aid of their ministry. In Maryland, they were pretty much spread in about a dozen places, but in Pennsylvania they could not be found in more than two or three spots outside of Philadelphia. Thus though the immigration commenced, the Catholic immigrants could find neither priest nor altar, nor associates in religious worship, save in a very few spots of these immense regions. I have before described the consequences of this lamentable dearth. To this is to be attributed the melancholy result, that so many thousands of the descendants of these first settlers are now found in the various sects.

Probably not ten priests arrived from Ireland with the many thousands of Catholics who flocked hither from that country, during the years which intervened between the establishment of independence and the erection of the first see at Baltimore, for the whole territory of the Union, in 1790. And whilst the people were scattered through the country, the priests were kept in the principal towns. Nor is it to be imagined that all the clergymen who, in the early days of our republic, migrated from Europe, were actuated in their transfer of residence by the purest zeal, nor that they were the persons best qualified to promote the cause of religion. Some of them, indeed, were men of that description and were extremely useful; but others were driven across the Atlantic by disappointment or by censure, and though they rendered occasional ser-

vices, unfortunately, they too often counterbalanced them by their scandals.

The leading citizens of these new states were not half civilized savages: they were men of strong understanding, many of whom had received the best education which the schools of Europe could bestow; they had improved their minds by that observation which travelling calls forth; they had served their country at a critical period in the council and in the field; they had associated with some of the best-informed men of the age, and they had read extensively. The influence of such men upon the society by which they were surrounded was powerful. Others, gifted with talent and ambitious of distinction, improved by their intercourse, laboured to emulate them, and frequently succeeded in the effort. He who can understand their language has but to read the compositions which emanated from their pens, and the report of the eloquent and manly speeches which flowed from their lips, and he must be convinced that no nation of only equal numbers furnished at the same time a larger body of admirable men than did the United States at the period which immediately succeeded their independence. Schools and colleges arose, governments were framed, courts of justice were established, religious congregations were organized: on every side creative efforts were made for every purpose.

But when, in the midst of this mighty movement, the observer contemplates the situation of the Catholic Church, he sees, indeed, a bishopric erected; the see is filled by a man worthy of his age, of his station, and of his religion, as well as of his country, but he is found to be comparatively powerless, because equally destitute of a proper clergy and of the means for its creation. The scattered Catholics were destitute of pastors, their children were lost to the church; the greater number of the few who exercised the ministry, were unable to remove the erroneous impressions of such a people as were found over the States. There were few opportunities; no books could be procured to defend Catholic doctrines, the principal portions of English literature, which necessarily became that of the United States, were filled with passages tending to destroy our religion by misrepresentation, by sophistry, by ridicule, and by wit; and through the whole country there was not found a press nor a bookseller to counteract this evil. The people sought for information upon the subject, and every source from which they could draw it was poisoned, every fountain at which they drank was tainted. Need we wonder at the continuance of prejudice, the dislike of our religion, the obloquy to which our principles and practices were exposed, or at the false shame which drew the pusillanimous from the profession of their creed?

We now arrive at another epoch, desolating for Europe, beneficial to America! The machinations of infidelity produced their horrible effects in France! Its religion was proscribed, its clergy was obliged to submit to banishment, to death, or to apostacy; several of its pious laity, escaping with their lives, found asylums in foreign lands, and not a few traversed the Atlantic. That small portion of the clergy that betrayed their holy charge, remained at home, and under the protection of the bad men who ruled, were intruded into desecrated sanctuaries to officiate at polluted altars; their faithful brethren were bathed in their blood, or lurked in hiding-places to serve the few who, at the peril of their lives, adhered to their religion and gave shelter to its ministers; but the great bulk of the holy band was found in exile weeping for the desolation of their country, and beseeching heaven to receive it once more to his mercy. The pious and learned emigrant clergy of France, not only edified several countries by their virtue, but elsewhere they aided greatly to the conversion of Protestants, by their zeal, their prayers, and their example. America had the good fortune to obtain several of them, and they became a very seasonable supply in this moment of her destitution. They made efforts to learn her language, and in many instances they were as successful as could reasonably be expected. There is no language more difficult for a foreigner, and it has its peculiar difficulties for one whose vernacular language is French; it is, therefore, that they who can speak it tolerably in public, are but rare exceptions amidst the great number that acquire it so as to be able to converse with facility. America has been fortunate in possessing a few of those exceptions. She has had two or three excellent men in her pulpits, to whom, even persons of taste and of information could listen with pleasure, and from whom they could derive much instruction, as well as gratification. A number of others were able to make themselves more or less intelligible, but I may say that, with scarcely an exception, all edified with their piety, and preached by their example. It is true, that persons who could speak fluently the language of the people, whilst they possessed the learning and the piety of those men, would have been more useful, especially if their habits and customs had better qualified them for mixing with the people, for serving upon the country missions, and for understanding the laws, and the civil and political institutions of the country; but such men could not then be found, and it was a peculiar blessing from heaven that this seasonable aid was obtained.

Shortly after this period, the insurrection in St. Domingo (now Hayti), caused great numbers of the colonists of that island to fly with such of their slaves as would accompany them; a few of the clergy came

with these emigrants, and they settled principally in the Southern States. Thus, the French portion of the Catholics in the Union was exceedingly well provided with spiritual aid, but it was far otherwise with the Irish, whose number was continually increasing in the sea-ports, though they went by thousands from these places to the interior, where settlements had already been made, and still farther west, to thin the forest and to subdue the land by cultivation; but in those regions no priest was then to be found.

Ireland had most of her continental establishments for clerical education destroyed by the French Revolution and by the wars which succeeded, and years elapsed before she could obtain, even under the still greater mitigation which her persecutors granted, houses in which her children could be assembled, professors to teach them, and funds for their support. The devotion of her prelates and of her people having made a commencement, the Irish government gave reluctantly and sparingly a miserable dole, which the economy of those to whose management it had been entrusted, expended to the best account. Still, however, many years elapsed before she could supply her own churches, and she naturally considered it to be her duty to make provision for them, before she would send any clergymen to those tens of thousands of her children, who, having left her shores, were to be found in so many parts of these western regions.

Thus, though there was an increase of a good clergy by reason of the French Revolution, it was not precisely of the description that was required in the new republics.

Besides the difficulties arising from the diversity of language and customs, there were some that occasionally arose from difference of political predilections. They who outraged religion and massacred the clergy in France, desecrated the name of liberty by the anarchy and despotism to which they so wickedly and inappropriately gave that appellation; and they moreover rendered the name of republicanism odious through a large portion of the world, by the atrocities which they perpetrated under the semblance of its sanction; and although the clergy of France who had escaped to America were sufficiently aware of the wide distinction between the well-regulated order of American republicanism and the licentious and tyrannical infidelity which assumed that name in France, and though several amongst them were gradually becoming attached to American institutions, still, amongst others, unpleasant recollections were excited by the similarity of name, and this could not always exist without an unpleasant influence upon a man who had suffered grievously in the land he loved, for whose ruin he wept, and the memory

of which, though dear to his heart, was blent with that of the murder of his cherished companions and devoted friends. It was not, and it could not be in his power always to suppress the exhibition of what he felt. Too often, the thoughtless or the envious, the enthusiastic admirer of liberty made a serious mistake, or took an unfair and an unkind advantage because of this exhibition. Hence, though the cause of religion in the United States gained greatly by this accession, yet it was not free from some disadvantage. And, perhaps, during the twenty years that succeeded the erection of the see of Baltimore, though there was a considerable increase of congregations and of religious opportunities, there was a vast loss to the church, because there was not a body of clergy sufficiently numerous and perfectly fitted to attend the emigrants that arrived from Germany and from Ireland.

Another great source of mischief was the loss of orphan children, even in those places where Catholic congregations were formed and priests were found; these children were placed in public or sectarian institutions, and almost universally lost for ever to the church.

Another may be added, that although there was a bishop, yet the peculiarity of his circumstances confined him almost exclusively to Baltimore and its vicinity, whilst his diocess, which was as extensive as half of Europe, could by no means have the advantage of his episcopal visitation.

SECTION VI

Before I leave this part of my subject, I must notice the foundation that was laid for much subsequent mischief, by the cause given for serious and anti-Catholic usurpations of trustees of church property, and for the schisms and disgraceful quarrels in churches.

I have previously, in a general manner noticed a want of acquaintance with our legal principles and provisions respecting property amongst some of the clergy. I may here observe, once for all, that unfortunately these principles and provisions seem to have been overlooked in some places to this day. I do not know any system more favourable to the security of religious rights and of church property than that of the American law. I have consulted eminent jurists upon the subject, I have closely studied it, and have acted according to its provisions in various circumstances, favourable and unfavourable, during several years, and in many of the details and as a whole, I prefer it to the law of almost every Catholic country with which I am acquainted. I think with the exception of one, perhaps two states, that it is a more honest,

fair, and liberal system. Like any other, it is liable to be abused, and sometimes the prejudices of the individual will accompany him to the bench or to the jury-box; but this is not the fault of the system. I shall give you an outline of its principles.

The government of each state is that which is to be considered the original sovereign; it pre-existed to the federation, and divested itself not of this sovereignty, but of the exercise of some of its powers, upon entering into the confederacy; and a new power, viz., the government of the United States, was subsequently created, for the purpose of exercising those sovereign attributes of whose use the several states had debarred themselves. They not only did not give to the general government any authority in religious concerns, but expressly stipulated that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Thus, whatever authority a government may rightfully possess in this respect, resides in the several state sovereignties; and in fact, they all at present act upon the principle of the above prohibitory enactment. The state does not then interfere with religion, which it considers to be the concern of each individual in his private capacity, and it leaves him in perfect freedom of worship, provided, that in the exercise of this freedom, he will not disturb the public peace, or infringe upon the rights of his fellow-citizens. The state also considers religion to be useful to society, and, therefore, an object for which a number of individuals, having common opinions and common principles, may lawfully and beneficially associate; and it considers that associations so formed ought to be protected by securing the property or funds which they may consecrate to this object, as well as by allowing them full opportunity of practising their rites and ceremonies according to their own views of propriety and utility, provided they do not thereby disturb the good order of society. The state, however, does not recognise in any society thus formed, any individual or class of persons as vested with more power than another, or as having any right not common to every other member, unless such power or right be created or recognised by the society itself. The state recognises in each society thus formed the right to make for itself a constitution or form of government, and by-laws for the management of its own concerns; and when they are regularly made, it recognises their force within that body; and generally speaking, it is willing to grant the privilege of incorporation to religious congregations upon the principles here exhibited.

Upon these principles, there is no difficulty for a body of Catholics to assemble, to form themselves into an association, to recognise the power of their Pope, of their bishop, of their priests, and the several

rights of each individual or body according to the doctrine and the discipline of their church; they can, without departing from that doctrine or discipline regulate the manner in which the property is to be held, and how it shall be managed, and can establish rules to restrict and to direct its managers. In a word, they can voluntarily bind themselves by special acts to maintain and observe the whole doctrine and discipline of their church, and can regulate that no person shall be admitted a member of their association without his undertaking this obligation, or shall continue a member if he violates his contract for such observance.

By this process of American law, no person is obliged to belong to any religious society except he shall desire it himself, and he cannot obtrude himself upon any religious society which is not willing to receive him, or whose constitution he violates: and the legal tribunals of the state must, should questions of litigation arise, govern their decisions by the constitution and by-laws of the society itself, provided these laws be not incompatible with the laws of the particular state or of the United States. But where the society makes no constitution, or does not adopt any special regulations, but merely has persons chosen as trustees to manage its concerns, without any special restrictions; these trustees have the power to make all regulations and to change them as they may think proper, during the term for which they have been chosen. Thus there may be trustees with limited powers in some churches, and in others their powers may be altogether undefined.

The Catholics, desirous of securing their property in the like manner as all other religious congregations were doing, frequently applied to the legislatures of the states to have it vested in incorporated trustees, to be elected by themselves, but they seldom or never made any special constitution or laws to regulate or to restrict the power thus conferred; or if they did make any regulations, they were altogether loose and by no means sufficiently precise or technically drawn; and thus the power of the trustees generally became unlimited: it extended, if they chose to use it, over property, priests, bishops, and every person and thing that belonged to the society. This, you will clearly perceive, was not a fault of the law, but a necessary consequence of not so applying its provisions as to suit the doctrine and discipline of our church. And it must be acknowledged, that for a considerable period, no churches in the Union had been more negligently managed in this respect than those of the Catholics; nor is it, even at this day, so easy to persuade some who have much influence in their direction, that the property can be better protected by the great principles of the law, than by expedients.

The evils arising from this ill-digested description of trusteeship caused immense detriment during the infancy of the American church; nor are they merely a part of the history of days that are passed away. Men in several instances, well-disposed in regard to religion, but by no means sufficiently informed of what was required by the doctrine of the church whose faith they held, acting, as they imagined for its interests, began to copy the regulations, and to follow the example of Protestant churches, and to consider their own clergy as a species of servants to perform religious services in the way that they deemed most convenient; they next proceeded, under the pretext of relieving the clergy from temporal cares, to exclude them from any share in the deliberations on the management of church concerns, though they forgot their own assumed principles whenever it was necessary to raise funds or to make collections; for on such occasions the clergy were expected to be drudges: and if the income was diminished, or that money was wanted to pay debts, or to make repairs, or for any other purpose, the reduction of the clergyman's salary was the most obvious and natural way to relieve themselves. This necessarily created discontent and estrangement: and if the clergyman complained, he was said to be avaricious and worldly-minded; if their right to change his wages at their own caprice was denied, the clergy was said to be ambitious and despotic, and the trustees soon claimed, and, in some instances, attempted to dismiss the priest, without even regarding the rights of the bishop, or the doctrines of their church. They have in several instances intruded bad men, men devoid of mission, having no jurisdiction, and have frequently wasted large sums of the church income in supporting schisms, and in persecuting their lawful pastors. At this moment there are many men living in several parts of the Union, who, in the sight of God, are bound to make heavy restitution to religion for the share which they have had in such disgraceful and mischievous practices. Many persons who were the leaders or conspicuous members amongst the schismatics on such occasions, were persons totally bereft of faith, men born of Catholic parents, and educated in the Catholic church, but who had by the influence of bad reading, of bad companions, or of their own immorality lost their faith and laughed at the practices of that religion which they however by money contributed to sustain, in order, as they said, that it might preserve their wives virtuous, and their children and servants in obedience. Such men may be seen lounging in the vicinity of the church, or carelessly, or curiously gazing within its precincts half a dozen times in the year; but whenever a schism was meditated, or a turmoil excited, no persons were more ready than were

these "Catholic atheists" to be in the foremost ground to protect their rights, to aid religion, and to preserve liberty, by opposing the bishop, by humbling the priest, and by teaching the whole body of the clergy the proper mode of governing the Catholic church!!! I give you in this but a brief and an imperfect outline of what my own register would show during a part of my own administration. I will not, however, deny that in some instances clergymen have forgotten the boundary of their sphere, and endeavoured to encroach upon that of the laity, but had a report been made, as was fitting, to the bishops, the remedy would have been quickly and effectually applied.

Hence I was convinced at an early period of my administration, that the remedy which was most natural, most safe, easiest, and most consonant to our legal position, was to designate, in such an instrument as the law would recognise and sanction, the line that separated the rights of the clergy from those of the laity, according to the principles of our doctrine and discipline, and to have it so adopted as to be legally binding, and legally protective for both.

I will here remark, that although in many places the clergy appear to have done very little, if anything to provide legal security for their rights, some of their cunning would-be masters have been exceedingly ingenious to procure a legal provision for the perpetual exclusion of priests or bishops from any share in the administration of church goods or property. I have seen some very curious specimens of this in the legislation of Louisiana, where to the casual observer the provisions would appear to be merely the suggestion of ordinary prudence for the respectable and useful administration of church affairs; yet it is in reality the studied deceitful cover which has been flung over mean and tyrannical usurpation, and is perfectly in keeping with that spirit which in so many other regions has, under the pretext of giving honour and protection to the church, subjected it to the worst despotism of the state.

The ill-regulated system to which I have thus adverted, has proved to be a source of great disaster, of many scandals, and of several schisms in the United States, and has estranged great numbers from the church, by disgusting many respectable and peaceable members, by driving many of the schismatics into heresy, and by fomenting, not only a spirit of disorder, of anarchy, and of contempt for discipline, but an estrangement from religious practices, an absence from the sacraments, and a destruction of the spirit of piety, in comparison to which the gross mismanagement of funds and other temporal losses are a mere insignificant trifle. Yet even in this respect the detriment has been very serious, and

the respectability which a congregation loses by an exhibition of this description is not to be regained by several years of subsequent good conduct.

At the first provincial council of Baltimore, in 1829, the present chief justice of the supreme court of the United States, then attorney-general of Maryland, together with two other respectable Catholic lawyers, having been consulted upon the subject of so securing church property as to insure also the observance of our peculiar discipline, gave their advice. There was, however, a disinclination on the part of nearly all the prelates then assembled, to adopt its principles as a regulation. But, though at present a considerable diversity of practice prevails in the several diocesses of the Union, there is much greater harmony upon this subject between the clergy and the laity: there is very little agitation of the subject, the former disputes have been amicably settled, and there does not appear to be any great probability of new differences arising; mutual confidence, a disposition to mutual respect and recognition, a more creditable zeal for the order and discipline of the church on the part of the laity, are the symptoms that give assurance of better times; and in most places, the experience of the good that has been produced by this line of conduct, not only in the prosperity of the church, the benefit to religion, the charity and affection of individuals, but also in the respectability which it brings to the church and to its members, as well as the spirit of piety which exists, would be sufficient to outweigh all the efforts which could be made to reproduce such disgraceful contests as those that for years had distracted and disgraced some of our churches, and tended to destroy our religion.

I have been exceedingly tedious in the details that I have given: but I felt it better to give you the history of the church, that you may be yourselves able to draw your own conclusions, rather than to give you my opinions, without laying before you the ground upon which I found them. It now remains for me to take as rapid a view as I can, of the period which has elapsed since the erection of the metropolis of Baltimore and the first suffragan sees of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown.

In 1808, the number of Catholics had considerably increased, especially in the large towns on the Atlantic shore, and in the regions west of Virginia and Pennsylvania. The Holy See considered that it would be advisable to accede to the request of Bishop Carroll and of his coadjutor Bishop Neale, to erect new sees in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and in Bardstown, in the state of Kentucky. In the next year, Baltimore was created a metropolitan see, and Doctor Carroll dignified with

the title of archbishop. Two French priests, who had laboured with zeal, assiduity, privations, and success upon those missions, were appointed to Boston and Bardstown. The names of Cheverus and of Flaget are sufficient to exhibit the wisdom of that selection; nor were they the only priests of that description then to be found upon those missions. Doctor Matignon, of Boston, was one of the same class, and whose humility and love for Doctor Cheverus, procured that the latter should take the place for which he had himself been designated. Two Irish priests were nominated for New York and Philadelphia, Dr. Concannon, who, though the first Bishop of New York, never beheld his see; he was consecrated in Rome, and died in Naples, on his way to America. Dr. Egan was the first Bishop of Philadelphia; the few years of his administration were years of difficulty. Doctor Connelly succeeded to New York; and therefore, upon his arrival, may be considered the first that entered upon its administration. Everybody admired his virtue, his humility, and his exertions in discharging the duties of the confessional, and attending the sick; but he was not generally considered to be a prelate acquainted with missions, and fitted to form a new and extensive diocess. One or two of his priests, however, were efficient and active, and much is due to the zeal and prudence of one of them who governed the diocess in times of difficulties, between his death and the nomination of his successor. Philadelphia got into great disorder, from whose consequences it was not easy to relieve it. The South demanded organization. New Orleans was committed to Dr. Dubourg, a man of the most extensive views: but he was without priests or means, and encountered many difficulties, he retired to St. Louis, and laid the foundation of that see, where numbers of Catholics, principally Irish, Germans, and Canadians, had begun to congregate. Charleston and Richmond were created about five years after the death of Archbishop Carroll, who may justly be styled the father of the struggling church. It is not the intention of the writer of this to pass judgment upon others; but he thinks that, amongst other mistakes, the opposition to the separate administration of this latter diocess, by causing its bishop to return to Ireland as soon as he could obtain permission from the Holy See, has been by no means favourable to the maintenance of religion in the state of Virginia. This mistake is about to be remedied, but the past cannot be recalled.

Still the emigration increased with a wonderful rapidity; the sees of Cincinnati and of St. Louis were next created; Florida was ceded to the United States, but years elapsed, churches were vacant, property was lost, and usurpations took place before the see of Mobile was created,

and it was then only a bishop who was established, without a clergy. It is but a short time since Detroit has been created into a see, and Vincennes has a daily increasing population of Irish and German Catholics pouring in upon its fertile vicinity. Railroads are now added to the canals that previously existed; the intercourse with Europe, and the facilities of passage have wonderfully increased. The population, which fifty years ago was three millions, is this day nearly seventeen, almost a sixfold increase. The Catholic settlers have been spread in thousands of places, not one-third of which can be attended to by the clergy of the country, and the consequences are too plain to be called into doubt. There is no question with regard to the increase of Catholics, the erection of churches, the organization of establishments, but the question is, has there not been a real and serious loss, by reason of the want of a clergy, and by reason of the great delays in doing even what has been already done. I fear that this loss is not only real, but exceedingly great.

The principal causes of these evils I considered to be, 1st. The pouring in of vast numbers of Catholic emigrants upon a country, where nothing had been previously done to enable them to practise the duties of their religion, but where every obstacle existed to render its profession and its practice exceedingly inconvenient, especially to strangers. 2d. The want of opportunity for the education of children of Catholics in the religion of their parents. 3d. The exposure of the numerous orphans left by emigrant Catholics, whose death, or misfortunes or criminality, left those unfortunate children to be educated in public institutions uncongenial to the religion of their parents. 4th. The want of a clergy sufficiently numerous to meet the demands upon their ministry, sufficiently well-informed to be able to act with judgment, and in many instances badly acquainted with the language, often incapable of giving public instruction, and not sufficiently aware of the nature of the government, the law, or the genius of the country. 5th. The invasion of this mission by many priests, who in Europe were found to be incorrigibly bad, or unable to act except under the guidance of others. 6th. Injudicious appointments to places of administration. 7th. The want of mutual confidence and co-operation, arising from throwing together people of several nations well-disposed and zealous, yet having too many points of peculiar habits and divided interest to allow their sufficiently acting in a body. 8th. The vigilance, activity, wealth, and co-operation of the various Protestant societies, which, though divided in religious belief, still are united in every effort to weaken or oppose the Catholics.

I have also, after long examination, laid before the holy father what I considered to be the indication of a simple and practicable remedy for some of those evils, not only in the United States, but over a far wider range of missions which suffer most severely, in many instances, from similar causes. In doing so, I consider that I have done all that is required of me. I have honestly expressed my view of what I was bound to examine; I shall feel well pleased if a better remedy can be devised than that which I have suggested; and if my opinions shall be considered unfounded, or my views to be incorrect, or my propositions impracticable, I shall at least feel that I have done all that my situation required or permitted me to do; and shall endeavour within my own sphere to discharge my duty in the best way that I can, satisfied that they who differ from me in opinion, are actuated by the best motives, and are at least equally gifted as I can pretend to be, with the faculties of observation and reflection, and that in due time proper remedies will be applied to evils which all acknowledge to be in existence and more or less powerful operation. It now remains for me to express my opinion of what your society has done.

I consider its existence to be one of the greatest benefits conferred upon religion in the United States, and its continued exertions at this moment to be not only highly useful, but indispensably necessary: for the active opposition of the enemies of our faith has been excited and strengthened, since they have observed that we have been aided by our friends in Europe, and they have by their supporters been greatly sustained in their efforts. Should we then be abandoned at such a moment, our power to resist them would be greatly diminished, and it would be questionable whether your former generosity would not prove in its results more injurious to religion than it has been beneficial. However, I have no fears upon this head; the principles by which you are guided, and the motives by which you are urged to action are my assurance. You are instigated by the love of God, by the love of your neighbour, by the zeal of religion, by the affection of charity. You are guided by those maxims of prudence which withhold you from interfering in what is not your province, whilst they make you active in your proper sphere. You have procured means for those who were destitute, and entrusted their application to the authority which, by the discipline of the church, had the right and power for its superintendence. If any mistakes have been committed in the disbursement, the fault is not yours; but you have full merit of the bounty that emanated from your generous charity, nor are you without your consolations. You have built churches, you have erected seminaries, you have sustained missions, you have cre-

ated convents, you have established schools, you have saved orphans from temporal misery and from eternal ruin, you have caused those who were blind to see the error in which they were, you have roused from their lethargy those whose ears had been long closed, to hear the testimony of truth, the terrors of judgment, and the invitations of virtue. You have made those who before were not able to move in the service of their God, now to run in the way of his commandments. You have caused the Gospel to be preached to the poor, the neglected, and the forlorn; in many a spot you have made what had been a desert, to bloom with the verdure of religion, to swell with the buds of virtue, to blossom the flowers of good works, to spread abroad the fragrance of good example, and to bring forth the fruits worthy of redemption. Thousands who sat in darkness and the shadow of death lift their hands to bless you, for the light and the warmth which they now enjoy from the splendour of the orient which has beamed upon them. You have already done much to alleviate the misery and to check the devastation which have long desolated the western hemisphere. Even now a mighty change has been effected, and you were amongst those who first procured and furnished the means that contributed to its production. Go on, then, with increased zeal and redoubled activity, and be assured that the good men in whom you confide will, under the guidance of heaven, discover and adopt the best mode of applying your benefactions to the greatest advantage.

With sentiments of high esteem,
And affection in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE DIOCESE OF CHARLESTON

[The account of the introduction of the Catholic religion into the States of North Carolina, etc., was published by Dr. England, in a pamphlet form, in Dublin, during his short stay in Ireland, on his way to Rome, in the year 1832.]

The diocess of Charleston comprehends North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, three of the most important states of the Confederation. Their respective population, by the census taken in the year 1830, is, North Carolina, 738,470—South Carolina, 581,458—Georgia, 516,504—making a total of 1,836,432 souls; being an increase of 353,875 over the census of 1820, and about one-seventh of the population of the entire United States, which, by the last census, was 12,856,407 souls, dwelling in twenty-four states, three territories, and the federal district. The northern boundary is the line which divides North Carolina from Virginia: this line runs west from the Atlantic, in the latitude of 36° 30′ N. The southern boundary is the St. Mary's river, which divides the state of Georgia from the territory of Florida, about six degrees south of the above line. It stretches on the east along the Atlantic Ocean from a little north of Currituck Inlet, nearly south, as far as Cape Hatteras, and thence southwest, an extent of upwards of 500 miles, having a considerable number of ports; the principal of which are, Edenton, Washington, Newbern, and Wilmington, in North Carolina; Georgetown, Charleston, and Beaufort, in South Carolina; Savannah, Darien, and St. Mary's, in Georgia. Its boundaries on the west are the state of Tennessee, from which it is divided by the Bald Mountains, and then by the Iron or Smoky Mountains, to a point where they strike the 35th degree of latitude, upon which parallel the line runs westward, to a place called Nicajack, near the Tennessee river, between the degrees of 85 and 86 longitude, west from Greenwich: from this point in the state of Tennessee, it is separated from the state of Alabama by a straight line running nearly south till it strikes the Chattahoochie river, at a place called Miller's Bend, a few miles south of the 33d degree of latitude: from this spot the river itself is the boundary, as it proceeds to discharge itself into the Gulf of Mexico, through Apalachicola Bay.

The number of Catholics spread through this large extent of

country is small indeed; few diocesses have so large space of territory, few have so small a Catholic population. At the period of the Revolution of 1776, it might be said that there was scarcely one member of our church in what is now the diocess of Charleston: still later, the tenets of that church were scarcely known; the most strange notions were entertained respecting the doctrines and practices of Roman Catholics, and the greatest obstacles presented themselves to the introduction of their religion. A brief sketch or outline of the early religious history of the three states, will show the nature of these difficulties.

The Carolinas were settled as a colony about one hundred and fifty years since, by English emigrants; the penal laws against Catholics were then in full force, and the hatred to their religion was violent in Great Britain; it was considered indeed doing a service to God and to the state, to oppress them; to keep this spirit in full vigour, the grossest misrepresentations of our doctrine were sedulously got up and circulated. The pardon of sins, already committed, by absolution obtained for money; leave procured under the name of indulgence, to perpetrate future crimes of the most atrocious description, at an exceedingly moderate charge; the principles that no faith was to be kept with heretics, that kings or princes who were not obsequious minions to the Pope, should be deposed, and ought to be killed, that all persons who were not members of the Catholic Church and consequently slaves to Rome, should be exterminated when ever an opportunity offered; these and a variety of similar exhibitions, as the true features of what was called "popery," were given to the world, as the justification of that barbarous code which then disgraced the British and Irish statute books. Numbers of simple and well disposed people, who had no means of detecting the falsehoods, sincerely believed the truth of statements made solemnly in the halls of legislation, from the pulpit, in the courts of justice, and even introduced into the very liturgy by which they approach to pay homage to their God. The high Church of England was fostered with peculiar care in the first settlements made in the vicinity of Charleston: parishes were laid off and ample provision secured for the maintenance of clergy: the laws against Catholics formed a portion of the colonial code, though indeed they were inoperative for want of subjects against whom they could be enforced. As the colony increased in age their notions of the Catholic religion became inveterate: nor was there a corrective—the colony received all its literature from the mother country. We all know how the history has been perverted to serve the purposes of what was called the "Reformation of religion," and to palliate the crimes committed by the dominant party in Great

Britain: even the British Parliament has lately testified against the forgers of plots, and the fabricators of falsehoods, by doing some tardy and imperfect acts of justice. America was supplied from the mother country with abundant addition to the original calumnies; every plot, every explosion, whether of a mine of gunpowder or of a meal-tub, was said to be the villany of "papists." No wonder that strange notions of our religion should be entertained by a colony thus tutored to the detestation of a calumniated people!

Carolina, however, received, as an addition to her settlers, a large body peculiarly fitted to imbibe their notions and to confirm the former opinions of the British colonists. After the revocation of the edict of Nantz, vast multitudes of the Huguenots left their native country sooner than abandon their religious tenets; considerable numbers of the most industrious and wealthy of those expatriated Protestants, filled with a deep sense of the injuries they had sustained, went to accept the lands which were assigned them in this new region. We can easily conceive how the feelings of gratitude to England, a great similarity of religious principle, a spirit of retaliation against those who drove them from their father's land, and a dislike of the Catholic religion, operated upon the minds equally ardent and susceptible. Though some of their own clergy, for a time, afforded them the peculiar ministrations to which they were accustomed, yet gradually they intermingled with the English settlers, and insensibly conformed to the English liturgy, and adopted the English articles of belief; so that after the lapse of a few years there was no perceptible religious distinction between the colonists. [75]

Some time subsequently to this settlement of the Huguenots, it was deemed useful to introduce new settlers of more limited means, but of a sturdy character, to form a barrier between the rich planters on the sea-coast and the tribes of Indians who then roamed through the western regions of the Carolinas. For this purpose the Protestants who resided in the northern parts of Ulster in Ireland, were considered peculiarly desirable; several of them emigrated and received encouragement. Not being generally descended from the aboriginal Irish, but chiefly from the Scotch colonists, who were placed upon the confiscated lands of the northern Irish Catholics; they were called Scotch-Irish, and were nearly all Presbyterians. Several of their relations from Scotland soon occupied portions of the country too, and large numbers of Presbyterians from the Highlands as well as from the Lowlands of Scotland, became colonists

[75] Since the period when this account was published, a portion of their descendants have formed a distinct, Huguenot congregation.

of this new region. From this it is easy to perceive that it was morally impossible that any accurate notion of the Catholic religion, or any sentiment in its favour, could be found in this country. This was the result of circumstances over which the colonists themselves had no control.

About a century has elapsed since Georgia began to be settled by Oglethorpe, who brought his colonists from Great Britain; and they were, of course, similarly circumstanced with their Carolinian neighbours, as regarded their opinions and feelings in respect to the Catholic religion; but there were other causes that greatly contributed to render it peculiarly obnoxious to Georgians.

Florida was then in the occupation of Spain, and the boundary line between the Catholic and the Protestant colonists not having been agreed upon, each endeavoured to enter upon what was claimed by the other. The enmity arising from border warfare and occasional depredations, was now superadded to the sectarian hatred, and the rancorous animosity arising from various causes; all seemed to merge itself in the single difference of religion. Any one who considers the manner in which the best English writers of that unhappy period described the Catholic nations of Europe, and attributed their fancied evils to their debased regions, can form some idea of what must have been the sentiments of a remote adventurer, whose imagination had been filled with a horror and contempt for "Popery," and who slept upon his arms, to be continually prepared against the treacherous incursions of "bloody and faithless Papists, banded together for his destruction."

As the French and Spaniards were the nations from which Great Britain had most to apprehend for her western colonies, and as she was frequently engaged in war with them, and several contests had taken place in the world between their several dependants, it became a part of the settled policy of the British government upon this ground, as well as for the causes previously alluded to, to excite to the highest pitch this sectarian antipathy. Let any one calmly consider the uninterrupted operation of these combined causes in this new country, without a single counteracting circumstance; let him reflect that every book that mentioned the Catholic religion, did so in terms of contumely and vituperation; that every description which was given, exhibited it as equally inimical to civil liberty, to religious truth, to pure morality, to the happiness of man, and to the sanctity of God; and can he be astonished, that after the lapse of a century, from the settlement of Carolina, the Catholic religion should be looked upon as an intolerable evil, and Catholics themselves as the very outcasts of society? How-

ever we may deplore the sad mistakes of a people thus systematically misinformed and excited, we must abstain from their condemnation.

It will not, after this, be considered very extraordinary, that in her list of charges against the British monarch, the colony of Georgia should have inserted one imputing to him the design of subverting liberty and destroying truth, by permitting, and even upholding the practices of the Catholic religion in Canada. Nor will it be matter of astonishment that in Charleston, two men, who were discovered to be Irish Catholics, should be accused of conspiring with the negroes against the liberties of the country, and be summarily condemned to an exhibition in tar and feathers, and subsequent banishment: neither will it excite our amazement to find, that at the period of the Revolution, the supposed friends of the King of England, as well as his ministers, should be shown forth in the same city as under the influence of the Pope and the devil, and in their joint keeping. These occurrences took place in the year 1775.

When the colonies declared themselves independent of Great Britain, on the 4th of July, 1776, there were very few Roman Catholics in the territory which now is attached to the see of Charleston; and these few had no ministry. It will be, therefore, easily seen, that for any particular purpose, their profession of belief would have been altogether useless, and circumstanced as they were, it would have been attended in most instances with consequences exceedingly unpleasant to themselves. Thus, although there were some Irish Catholics, especially in the Carolinas, their existence was absolutely unknown not only to their neighbours of other religious denominations, but they in most instances did not know each other. Fifty years after this period, owing to similar causes, the writer of this sketch has frequently discovered and introduced to each other as Catholics, persons who had during several years been residing in the same vicinage without the slightest suspicion on the part of either, that the other was of the same religion as himself. In many instances these persons intermarried with those of other religions, without even intimating what was their own, and at this day it is believed not to be an exaggerated estimate to state that in this diocess the descendants of Catholics, who, by reason of the want of a ministry, now belong to other denominations, are four times as numerous as the actual number of those who belong to the church.

When the colonies, having asserted their independence, became sovereign states, each of them formed a constitution for its own government; most of them retained in one way or the other the old principle of excluding Catholics from places of trust or of emolument; but in

the subsequent amendment of those constitutions, the better sense of a more enlightened people cast away this remnant of British bigotry. North Carolina still retains it upon her books, as does New Jersey; but were they to have the opportunity of amending their fundamental laws, these blurs would quickly be expunged. In South Carolina and Georgia they have long since disappeared. Yet the consequences of degrading enactments will not always cease upon the repeal of the law itself; public opinion may demand the abolition of an obnoxious, or of a disgraceful statute, and yet the private opinion be, in a great measure, unchanged as to supposed causes which produced the discarded provision. The folly and the injustice of the exception operated the change in the constitution, though unfortunately the notions respecting the errors and the abominations of the Scarlet Lady have not become antiquated, though they are corrected to a great extent. Thus, though there has not, during many years, existed any legal impediment to the political progress of the Catholic, yet the strong current of popular opinion set strongly against him, and still does in most part of the Southern States. One instance out of many is noticed. Only four or five years have elapsed since, in one of the judicial districts of South Carolina, a lawyer called upon a jury to acquit his client, who was charged with a felony, upon the ground that the only testimony which would fasten the offence upon him, was that of a Catholic, and that as a Catholic was not credible upon oath, there was no evidence to sustain a conviction. The judge, however, differed from the advocate, and charged the jury that, to his own knowledge, the statement was unfounded, for that Catholics were very well instructed in the nature of an oath, and as well disposed to revere its sanction, as any other persons that he knew. Shortly afterwards, that judge mentioned the fact to the Catholic bishop, with a recommendation that he would endeavour to preach in the district, and by the explanation of the tenets of his church, remove the prejudices of his fellow-citizens. This judge was a member of the Protestant English Church, and the descendant of a Huguenot.

Previous to the year 1776, several religious changes, in which Catholics had no concern, took place: as, however, their consequences might in some degree be exhibited in the variety of religious denominations now existing in those three states, and thus in a measure affect Catholicism, it is well to give a few lines to a general notice. Whitfield and Wesley, the great founders of Methodism, laboured for no short period, and with a good share of success in this field; the number of their followers was considerable, and in several places no other form of religion was known. The structure of Methodism in many parts

of the colonies differed from what it continued to be in the mother country. In Great Britain there were preachers, who excited the people to feel a greater interest in religion, to live according to a prescribed method, and to be zealous for the conversion of others; but, properly speaking, the sect, if it may be so called, had no peculiar clergy: the members went to the clergy of the established church for sacraments; by that clergy their children were baptized; from that clergy they received the Lord's supper; and not only did that clergy administer sacraments to this people, but by them they were married, and by them were buried. For the colonies, however, Mr. Wesley ordained a bishop, and that bishop ordained priests and deacons: thus Methodism, in place of being, as then it was in Europe, a mere association of the more pious members of the established church, became, to all intents and purposes, a separate sect, differing from that by law established, very little in its articles of belief, but very considerably in its discipline. At first the organization was not full, nor the separation complete; but gradually the form became more distinct and the body had its parts made perfect. The Church of England did not, of course, recognise this new hierarchy. Though it believed Mr. Wesley to be a priest, it did not believe that he could consecrate a bishop, nor could it therefore admit that the persons whom he undertook to ordain, received any addition to their power, or any authority for their mission, by the imposition of this gentleman's hands. Mr. Wesley argued upon a principle which was by no means new amongst Protestants, that the necessity of the case warranted a deviation from the old institution, and supplied whatever might be wanting in either order or jurisdiction. His followers acquiesced, became as perfectly satisfied with the sufficiency of their ordination as that of the gentleman by whom they were, as they believed, over fastidiously opposed; and they were fully content with the ministrations of their new and zealous clergy, whose activity, earnestness, regular habits, and perseverance soon increased the numbers of their adherents.

The Germans have sent many industrious and active settlers to this new hemisphere; and considerable numbers of them took up their abode on the banks of the river Savannah, which separates Georgia from South Carolina. Several of them also settled in the Carolinas. They of course were Protestants, for the Catholics were inadmissible, except in Pennsylvania. These colonists introduced Lutheranism; they had their own pastors, who were not only unmolested, but treated with considerable kindness, and in many instances experienced as much favour as the clergy of the establishment.

As the Indians removed towards the west, and the trade of the

colonies began to increase, migrations from the more northern settlements introduced Baptists and Independents: they too received a tacit permission, and occasional encouragement; so that, at the period of the revolution, though the English form of Protestantism was that by law established and dominant, yet it was far from being that which was professed by the larger portion of the colonists of the Carolinas and Georgia.

Perhaps no one of the colonies, at this period, stood higher than South Carolina in literary attainments, polished manners, high and generous feelings, and all that could elevate the character of its leading citizens. The planters enjoyed considerable wealth, had their children educated in the best schools in England, in which they had themselves attained information and credit; they also exercised a splendid hospitality, and were deservedly esteemed as disposed to patronise, in their own land, literature and the fine arts: but yet the several causes which I have enumerated led them to consider the Catholic religion in an exceedingly unfavourable point of view.

Enough has been given to show how numerous and great would be the difficulties of an humble member of the Catholic Church, in the midst of such circumstances. It will therefore be easily perceived why, though several Catholic settlers had privately introduced themselves, they were not only not known by their neighbours, but not even by each other, to be of that religion.

Some time about the year 1786, a vessel bound to South America put into the port of Charleston. There was a priest on board: as well as can be recollected, he was an Italian. The few Catholics who now began in the city to be acquainted with each other, and to enjoy the benefit of that toleration which followed the revolutionary struggle, invited him to celebrate mass, which he held in the house of an Irish Catholic, for a congregation of about twelve persons. This might be marked as the introduction of the Catholic religion to the present diocess of Charleston. As the vessel delayed but for a short time, no other duty appears to have been done by him. However, this little manifestation of their faith by the few who attended, induced others, who observed it, to be more confident; and it was soon discovered that the number of Catholics in the city was larger than any of themselves had supposed. In a year or two afterwards an Irish priest (Mr. O'Reily) spent a short time in that city, and officiated as far as the state of his health, which was feeble, would permit; but he soon left the state, it is thought, for the West Indies. Soon afterwards another Irish clergyman (Rev. Doctor Keating) came thither: and in the year 1789 the

little congregation made an effort to purchase a small piece of ground, close to the town, upon which an old meeting-house, that had been used by the Methodists or some other sect, was in a very ruinous condition. The Catholics were almost exclusively Irish settlers; their means were exceedingly limited; but they were generously assisted by their fellow-citizens, and succeeded in securing the ground, and giving some necessary repairs to the edifice. In the year 1790, upon a review of the constitution of the state of South Carolina, the odious clauses excluding Catholics from place and honours were stricken out; and in 1791 the Roman Catholic Church of Charleston was incorporated by an act of the Legislature of South Carolina. Doctor Keating went from Charleston to Pennsylvania, and died in Philadelphia. Thus was this struggling flock again left with out a shepherd.

During their dependent state, the jurisdiction for these colonies was derived through the vicar apostolic of the London district: this, of course, was not altered by the political revolution which made them independent civil states. Yet it was for several reasons judged proper to render America as independent of Great Britain in her spiritual, as she now was in her civil or political situation. The proper steps were taken for this purpose; and Baltimore, having been considered as the most convenient location for an episcopal see, was selected for that end; and the Rev. John Carroll, who stood conspicious for virtue and learning, and deservedly beloved and respected amongst his brethren and their flocks, and who had rendered service to the states in their struggle, was nominated its bishop. He came to Europe to receive the sacred character; and on the 15th of August, 1790, the festival of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, he was consecrated in the chapel of Lulworth Castle, the property of the Weld family, by one of the vicars apostolic of England. His diocess comprised the entire of the thirteen United States of America. Shortly after his return, the little congregation of Charleston transmitted an address of congratulation to their prelate, stated their destitute condition, and requested a pastor, whom they would use every effort to support. Bishop Carroll, in his answer, lamented his inability, owing to the great want of priests, to comply with their request, exhorted them to perseverance and piety, and assured them that he would use his best efforts to have their wants supplied, as soon as it should be in his power. This little congregation was at a distance of about six hundred miles from the nearest priest; and should one go to minister to them, he would be himself at that distance from any opportunity of receiving the sacrament of penance, or in case of danger the sacrament of extreme unction. Still, however, in such

instances, the Almighty will reward and sustain with his extraordinary graces, those men who, with a noble charity, place their confidence in his mercy, and devote themselves to the salvation of souls and the propagation of the faith. If they enter upon such a mission with such motives, persevering in prayer, and cherishing their piety by wholesome devotional practices, and the regularity of their habits, he who "breatheth where he will," and before whom a cup of cold water given for the sake of Christ will not lose its reward, will amply supply, by his immediate influence, the want of those ordinary means, which it would be great criminality to neglect when within our reach, from the opportunity of using which it can never, under the usual circumstances, be lawful to depart; but the absence of which can be supplied for those who are duly called, or properly sent into such a desert, by him who commanded ravens to feed his prophet.

In the year 1793, the Reverend S. F. O'Gallagher, a native of the city of Dublin, a man of extraordinary eloquence, of a superior intellect, and finely cultivated mind, arrived in Charleston, with the authority of the Bishop of Baltimore, to collect the little flock that had been scattered, and to repair the building that had almost crumbled into ruin. This was no easy task; though the learning and elocution of the pastor drew to this tottering remnant of a wooden church, the first rank and talents of the city. The ground was set apart as a place of burial for the congregation, that became more numerous than it had been; but their means not being adequate to the maintenance of their pastor, he engaged as one of the teachers in the Charleston college: so that still having sufficient leisure from his school duties to attend to the calls of his congregation, he in a great measure relieved them from the weight of what would otherwise be necessary for his support.

Efforts were now made to give a more permanent form to this congregation, and with a considerable degree of success; but still a variety of obstacles, which it would be as tedious as unnecessary to enumerate, made the task exceedingly difficult.

At this period, also, a few Catholics from Maryland removed into the state of Georgia, to the vicinity of where the church of Locust Grove was subsequently built; previous to their removal they applied to the bishop for a clergyman to accompany them, but were unable to obtain this blessing; yet was the spot on which they settled destined to be that from which the Catholic Church, in this state, should date its origin.

The French Revolution was not without its effect upon the nascent church of the United States. At this period, when infidelity and licentiousness usurped and disgraced the name of liberty, a cruel persecu-

tion drove from their shores some of the best of the French clergy, who had been able to escape from the lanterne, the guillotine, the pike, the musket, and the poniard. The labours of these men were crowned with blessings to the more northern regions, but they did not spread themselves into the southern Atlantic States; so that, as regards the diocess of Charleston, their arrival was not a matter of much importance, though exceedingly beneficial to other parts of the Union; and, at a subsequent period, the steady virtue and bright example of some of these good men, formed a strong contrast to the vices of some bad priests who, rejected from the ministry of their native land, betook themselves to a new country, where the dearth of a clergy who could speak the language of the people, almost compelled to the experiment of placing confidence in their protestations of repentance for the past, and fidelity to their engagements. Alas! how extensive and pernicious have been the evils produced in America from this melancholy source!

The effects of this revolution were also felt in the French colony of St. Domingo; and when the revolted negroes had spread ruin and carnage through a large portion of the island, some of the surviving, but now impoverished, colonists fled to the United States. They were received with a kind and generous hospitality, and several of them settled in Charleston, others at Savannah and Augusta, in Georgia. One of their priests found his way to the little colony of Maryland, about fifty miles above Augusta, and began, with the authority of Bishop Carroll, to discharge the duties of his ministry. This was the commencement of the church of Georgia, a short time after the arrival of Dr. Gallagher in Carolina. This missionary paid some visits to the refugees in Augusta and Savannah, and found there, also, some Irish Catholics who began to think of forming themselves into congregations. The upper settlement was soon abandoned by him for that near the sea, where the numbers were greater; and Savannah, after a few years, became the fixed residence of a priest, after two or three transitory missionaries had died or departed. The congregation was incorporated by the Legislature of Georgia; the city council gave a grant of land to build a church; the zeal of the Catholics, and the generosity of their fellow-citizens, furnished the means for its erection, and an edifice of wooden framework, with a small steeple, was raised; though its dimensions were not large it sufficed for its congregation, which was served for some years by a Rev. Mr. Le Mercier, and subsequently by the Rev. Dr. Carles, now vicar-general to the Archbishop of Bordeaux. Savannah is about one hundred and twenty miles southwest of Charleston; so that there was some opportunity afforded to their pastors oc-

casionally to see each other. Augusta, which was about the same distance, in a northwestwardly direction from Savannah, and on the river of that name, was sometimes visited; but owing to the difficulties and the distance, the upper and original colony very seldom had any spiritual opportunity. There some of the members fell off into other congregations, and in many instances the children were neglected.

In Charleston, the old wooden building had been taken down and a brick church erected in its stead, of such dimensions as were considered sufficient for the congregation, and even to leave room for some strangers: its length is about sixty feet, and its breadth nearly forty, with a small gallery which contains an organ; a porch was added several years after, consisting of a good pediment along the entire front, sustained by four handsome columns, upwards of twenty-five feet in height. The cemetery of this church, which is now in the center of the city, affords, in the inscriptions of its monuments, the evidence of the Catholicity of those whose ashes it contains. You may find the American and the European side by side; France, Germany, Poland, Ireland, Italy, Spain, England, Portugal, Massachusetts, Brazil, New York, and Mexico, have furnished those who worshipped at the same altar with the African and the Asiatic, whose remains are there deposited: during life they were found all professing one faith, derived from a common source; after death their remains commingle. The family of the Count De Grasse, who commanded the fleets of France, near the commodore of the United States and his partner, sleep in the hope of being resuscitated by the same trumpet to proceed from their neighbouring beds of earth to the possession of thrones purchased by the blood of their common Redeemer.

About the year 1810, Augusta had a pastor of its own. An Augustinian friar, the Reverend Robert Browne, who had for some time served on the mission in the city of Dublin, resided here, and visited those of the upper colony, who remained faithful. The Legislature of Georgia incorporated the Catholics of Augusta, and authorized the trustees of the Richmond Academy to convey to them a very fine lot of land, in a convenient spot at an outlet of the city, upon which was raised, by subscription, the brick church of the Holy Trinity, fifty feet in length by twenty-five feet wide, with a convenient vestry room annexed to the altar end. Some years afterwards, under the incumbency of a succeeding pastor, a very excellent house was built contiguous to the church, for the residence of the clergyman. There was also a lot of ground, containing two acres, given in the upper district by one of the congregation; upon this ground a church was built of logs, and a burial ground

was enclosed with a fence. This same gentleman gave also a sufficient farm, adjacent to the church, for the support of a priest.

The church of South Carolina had been unfortunately retarded in her course, and distracted by miserable dissensions, the particulars of which would be to the readers of this sketch as unintelligible as they would be uninteresting. The pastor of Augusta was, after a few years, called to aid in the administration of the church of Charleston, and thus Augusta was again left vacant. Several of the members who stood in some degree of estimation in the flock at Charleston, and who possessed most worldly means, absented themselves through disgust, and the church itself was not unfrequently closed, and the regular pastor was more than once excluded and driven to officiate in a private house. Though the number of Catholics in this city had greatly increased by arrivals from Ireland, and other parts of Europe, in addition to the number of colonists and slaves who fled from St. Domingo; yet owing to their wretched dissentions, no progress was made in the religious state of their society. An emigrant, who arrived in that city about the year 1809, was desirous of making his Easter communion, and not finding any other persons preparing, he hesitated for some days, until discovering two others similarly circumstanced with himself, the three made their preparation, and few, if any others, were known to have then acted in like manner.

In North Carolina, an Irish priest, (Mr. Cleary,) who was a canon of the church of Funchal, arrived at Newbern, to look after some property which had devolved to him by the death of a near relative, in that vicinity. He celebrated Mass, and administered the sacraments to a few Catholics, who resided in and near the town; he did not very long survive his relative; his remains were interred in Newbern.

The progress of religion in other parts of the United States was very different from that which the South exhibited. In 1810, Baltimore had been raised to the dignity of an archbishopric, and four new sees created and made suffragan thereto, viz., Boston, of which the present Archbishop of Bordeaux (the Most Rev. Doctor Cheverus) was the first bishop; New York, for which see the Right Rev. Doctor Concannen, an Irish Dominican friar was consecrated; Philadelphia, of which the Right Rev. Michael Egan, an Irish Franciscan friar was first bishop; and Bardstown in Kentucky, for which the present venerable and apostolic prelate, Right Rev. Doctor Flaget, a native of France, was consecrated. Doctor Carroll survived as archbishop until the close of the year 1815, when he was succeeded by his coadjutor, the most Rev. Doctor Neale, whose death in a couple of years caused a vacancy, which

was filled by the appointment of the Most Rev. Doctor Mareschall, a Sulpician priest, born in the diocess of Orleans in France, but who at the period of his appointment to the Metropolitical see of the United States, had spent considerably near twenty years in that country.

In 1817, peace was in some degree restored to the church of Charleston, by the exertions of the present respectable bishop of Boston, Doctor Fenwick, a native of Maryland, and a member of the society of Jesuits, who was accompanied by the Rev. Doctor Wallace, a native of the county of Kilkenny, in Ireland. By the prudent administration, the zealous discharge of every duty, and the conciliating manners of those gentlemen, and by removing some of the causes of the previous irritation, much good was effected; the people were reunited, the church reopened, and the sacraments again regularly approached, by many who had been long absent.

Georgia had, however, been exposed to affliction. The pastor who had succeeded Mr. Browne in Augusta, after that church had been for some considerable time vacant, became negligent and scandalous, and finally apostatized. His place was, however, supplied by the Rev. Mr. Cooper, a zealous American priest, who was a convert to the church.

In North Carolina, two small congregations, one at Washington, in Beaufort County, the other at Newbern in Craven County, were also visited by the Rev. Nicholas Kearney, an Irish priest, who had been stationed at Norfolk, in Virginia, where the church had been recently built, by the exertions of the Rev. Father Lacey.

The Rev. Dr. Carles had left Savannah for France some time after the restoration of the Bourbons. Dr. Gallagher had taken charge of the church of that city, which was now somewhat enlarged, for its increased congregation, principally composed of Irish settlers; and the Rev. Mr. Browne proceeded to Rome, for the purpose of pressing, on behalf of the people, a petition, in the propriety of which the archbishop also acquiesced, that the Carolinas and Georgia should be separated from the see of Baltimore, and placed under the jurisdiction of a new see to be erected in Charleston. This was done on the 11th of July, 1820; and the Rev. Doctor England, who at that time was parish priest of Bandon, in the diocess of Cork, but who had, more than once, previously sought leave to serve on the American mission, was appointed to the newly erected see, which was, of course, made suffragan to Baltimore; he was consecrated in the Roman Catholic church of St. Finnbar, in the city of Cork, on the festival of St. Matthew, the apostle and evangelist, the 21st of September of that year, and soon proceeded across the Atlantic to take possession; which he did in the latter end of December.

Upon his arrival the bishop found only two churches occupied, and two priests doing duty; one at Charleston, and one at Augusta. He had ordained two priests in Ireland for the new diocess, previous to his departure; one of them, the Rev. Denis Corkey, accompanied him. After a few days' delay in Charleston, Doctor E. proceeded to Savannah, where the church was vacant; the number of Catholics was about five hundred, which was probably one-eighth of the population: he appointed the Rev. R. Browne their pastor. In Augusta he found Rev. S. S. Cooper, of whom mention has been previously made; here the Catholics were not as numerous as at Savannah. After having spent a few days at Locust Grove, he organized the remnant of the congregation in the upper district, and encouraged them to repair their church, leading them to hope they might soon have a pastor. In Columbia, the political capital of South Carolina, he found a few families of Irish Catholics, and some tradesmen and labourers, who were employed in constructing a canal; after officiating for them, he returned to Charleston, and sent Mr. Corkey thither. Confirmation was for the first time administered in the church of Charleston, in Lent and at Easter: the number of communicants at the previous Easter had been 175; this year they were considerably more numerous; and upwards of 180 were confirmed, amongst whom were some converts.

Finding the mode in which the church property had been hitherto invested, liable to serious abuses, and having, in several instances, been the occasion of incalculable mischief, he determined upon making an effort to procure, in an eligible situation, ground upon which a cathedral might be erected; and which should be so invested as to guard against such evils as arose in the administration of the old church. A very fine lot, in one of the best parts of the city, was purchased, and the necessary securities given for the payment. Mr. Cooper having determined upon leaving Augusta, Mr. Corkey was sent thither; and leaving the Rev. Doctor Fenwick, who had consented to remain for some time, together with the Rev. Dr. Gallagher, in Charleston, the bishop proceeded to visit North Carolina. In this large and populous State he found, indeed, the descendants of Catholics, principally Irish, in great numbers, but altogether estranged from the religion of their fathers, of which they had heard extraordinary and libellous accounts; he found comparatively few who adhered to their belief, but who had had no opportunity of its practice. He preached, he explained, when it was necessary, he administered sacraments, and received some converts; but several, who declared themselves convinced of the truth of the Catholic religion, declined being received into the church, upon the ground that it would be

useless for them to profess a religion which they could have no opportunity of practising; as the bishop could not say when it was likely they should again see a clergyman. Four months were thus spent, during which the prelate travelled through a considerable portion of his diocess without meeting a priest.

He then proceeded to the more northern states, for the purpose of meeting some of his more experienced brethren, and consulting with them upon the means by which the Catholics might be collected or visited, and a useful clergy procured. Unfortunately, owing to peculiar circumstances, the prelates were not in the habit of meeting; and whilst their opponents, in a variety of ways, had all the advantage of common counsel and united action, the clergy of the American Catholic Church were left to little better than individual and isolated efforts. Without intending to insinuate that this arose from the fault of any one, and abstaining from passing any judgment upon others, or admitting any negligence on his own part, the writer of these pages deeply felt and bitterly lamented the baneful consequences of this state of things. In no church under heaven is the frequent consultation of the clergy, especially of the prelates, more necessary than in the American Catholic Church; in none would it be attended with more happy results; in none has less opportunity of this description been afforded.

The Bishop of Charleston being anxious to procure a clergy for people so greatly destitute, and so exceedingly desirous of its ministry, engaged some priests whom he met unemployed to enter his diocess; some of them appeared for a time to be useful,—but there was scarcely one that he had so received, whose admission he had not cause to regret, and whom he was not under the necessity of requesting to withdraw, and whose departure was not generally attended with considerable expense. Dr. Fenwick having returned to his society, from which he had only departed to supply, for a time, the destitute missions of the south,—Doctor Gallagher having gone to a more southern station, beyond the limits of the diocess,—Mr. Corkey having died, greatly lamented, where he gave every promise of extensive usefulness,—and some of those newly received priests having departed at the suspected approach of sickness, and others for other causes,—after two years from his arrival, the bishop was left nearly alone.

Thus circumstanced, he determined upon embracing the opportunity which presented itself, of opening a good classical school, and enabling some candidates for orders who had applied to him, and whom he found extremely well qualified to communicate knowledge, by teaching therein to earn the means of their support, whilst they should pursue their own

studies under his direction. He received great encouragement from the citizens of all denominations; the examinations, and the progress of the pupils, met all the expectations that had been formed, and a bright prospect began to open before him. Calculating upon the continuance of this patronage, he engaged some other assistants at a considerable expense. When his arrangements were nearly completed, and he was made responsible for a heavy expenditure, an unexpected blow struck him to the earth. Some of the sectarian papers, of which there are several in the United States, warned the parents of Protestant children to be careful of their charge, and not to permit them to be seduced. No religious instruction whatever was given in the school to either Catholic or Protestant; the subject of religion was, indeed, never either mentioned or alluded to within the class halls, or on the play-grounds; the school was merely one to which the children came for classical instruction; and the declaration was now publicly inserted in the papers by the bishop, who was president of the seminary, that the charge of tampering with the religion of the children was altogether unfounded,—and they who made the assertion were challenged to the proof; no attempts were made to sustain it, nor could any such attempt be successful, because the statement was absolutely untrue. But new ground was taken. It was not urged now in print, but the pulpit was brought to bear upon the principle of having the children preserved from religious error; it was whispered in the visits to the family, that the daily habit of intercourse with priests, the feeling of deference to the opinion of their teachers, and a thousand other circumstances, would destroy in the minds of the children that salutary horror they should entertain for the "errors and the deformities of Popery." Also, it was communicated that the persons who sent their children to such a school actually taxed themselves to set up "the Romish Church," in an undeserved elevation; for the money thus given was applied to the creation of priests. A highly respectable committee of some of the most ancient families and wealthy citizens, in the mean time, not only received the contributions of their friends, in addition to their own,—but went round to collect, from house to house, the means of rebuilding and reopening a college for the city of Charleston, which had been closed, and was falling to decay. The clergy of the various denominations united to take this establishment under their patronage, and a grant of confiscated lands to a certain amount was made to it by the legislature of the state. The pupils of the seminary under the bishop, which had with some difficulty been incorporated, now made the best entrances, and took the high honours in the college of the state at Columbia; yet, this notwithstanding, within

three months of the opening of this new college in Charleston, upwards of one hundred children were withdrawn from the seminary, and the bishop left with not thirty pupils to meet the heavy engagements into which he had entered, under other auspices. This first created a debt, which, for a considerable time, weighed heavily upon this infant institution. The object of its opponents was in a great measure attained; though not destroyed, it was enfeebled, and the operations of its principal were clogged and embarrassed. They who achieved this defeat, probably imagined they were doing a service to religion and their country. It is for another tribunal, and not for us, to pass judgment upon them. From that period to the present, this seminary continues to afford to the few pupils who are committed to the care of its teachers, the opportunity of a sound, and extensive, and tasteful classical education, as also of a perfect algebraic and an extended mathematical course. Within its walls the present clergy of the diocess, with two exceptions, have received their clerical education from the prelate who ordained them,—and others who are serving in the ministry of other diocesses, have here also imbibed, from the same source, a large portion of that knowledge that fitted them for the stations they occupy.

The small number of priests, and the scattered situation of the flocks, made it necessary to the bishop and his clergy to spend a considerable portion of their time in missions to the various parts of the country; frequently it was necessary to travel one hundred miles to reach the habitation of even one single family, in which two or three communicants would be found, to baptize a child, or to minister the sacrament of confirmation. On those occasions the missionary, upon his arrival in any town or village, was personally waited upon by a few of the citizens, who, whatever might be their denomination, invited him to preach, and procured for him either a church, a court-house, a school-room, or some other convenient place. Here he had the opportunity of entering as fully as he pleased into the explanation and vindication of his tenets, and removing misconceptions and prejudices. The ceremonies of the church in the solemn administration of the sacraments, and in offering holy sacrifice of the Mass, the vestments, the furniture of the altar, its decorations, the language,—all were calculated to produce an impression exceedingly unfavourable to the church, if performed or exhibited without explanation, to a people naturally, and habitually, and reasonably desirous of understanding everything they saw, especially on so important an affair as that of religion. These explanations not only afforded exceedingly convenient topics for the speaker, but elevated religion in the minds of those who now saw solemn,

sublime, and salutary lessons of the deepest interest, where they had been led to expect only a sort of ridiculous semblance of magic and superstition, in place of the lessons of the eternal Gospel of the Redeemer.

The kindness, the attention, the hospitality of the citizens, on such occasions, is above all praise. Though they should respectfully avow their dissent from the doctrines or principles set forth by the missionary, they will not therefore undervalue his understanding, nor impute to him any unbecoming motive,—and few, if any of them, will use a harsh or an unkind expression. Wherever the writer of this compilation has found language of this sort used, he generally found that it was not spoken by a native of Carolina or of Georgia; more frequently it emanated from one born at the eastern side of the Atlantic. They will honestly and candidly own their change of opinion, the correction of their mistake, the removal of the error under which they labour.

There is, in the American mind, a predisposition to religion; and it will in general be the fault of a clergyman himself, if he be not treated with respect, and frequently with affection. But the persons who cherish this feeling, will not make a blind sacrifice of their understandings at the altar of him whom they most esteem; they require to be convinced of the propriety and necessity of what they are called upon, in the name of religion, to perform; and this conviction is not always easily attained. They who exhibit even the least cultivated portion of this people [as] rough, rude, obtrusive, and troublesome, do not know their character,—nor do they take into account, the difference of national customs, and modes of communicating ideas, or exhibiting respect; they have but one rule for every nation, and they would imitate the cruel tyranny of Procrustes, in forcing the observance of this single iron mode. Every American feels, when he addresses another man, [that] he is, to a certain degree, his equal; he seeks for the recognition of this principle as a right, and perceiving this once granted, his anxiety then will be to make every concession on his part which courtesy and kind feelings would suggest, or superiority of information or peculiarity of station could challenge. In the better educated classes, there exists that polish and urbanity, which is naturally expected from men of this description in every place; but in America there is this additional circumstance, that dignity is not supposed to consist in a cold and repulsive reserve, but in so communicating with others, as to make them aware that, whilst you respect their feelings, you must have your own held equally sacred. Thus, on these missionary excursions, there is ample room afforded for the diffusion of a correct knowledge of our holy religion.

It may not be amiss here to give an outline of the state of society in these three states. It consists, in the first place, of planters, or owners of large landed property, and farmers; these latter are not tenants, holding from superior landlords, but men who are themselves the holders of the land in fee simple, but of more limited means than the planters. Indeed the distinction is merely arbitrary, for the person whom one would call a farmer, will, by another, be considered a planter: as both expressions are used, it was thought proper to explain them. The whole of the land, with scarcely an exception, is occupied by citizens of this description; they are themselves its cultivators: there is scarcely known such a farmer as is found in Ireland, viz.: a man who tills ground for which he pays a yearly rent to the owner of the fee; a very few may perhaps be met with, but the number is so small as not to be taken into account. There is no such being as a middle man. The agricultural labourers are almost exclusively negro slaves, who belong to the owner of the soil; they are not serfs attached to the land, but slaves, who are themselves considered as the complete property of the owner, by whom they have been purchased, or in whose family they were born. They are not imported, for the laws of the United States make it piracy to bring a negro from Africa or any foreign land, into slavery. This has been the case since the year 1808. Besides this, most of the states in which negro slavery exists, prohibit, under exceedingly severe penalties, the introduction of a slave even from a contiguous state. But each state being perfectly sovereign respecting those subjects which have not been specially granted to the general government of the United States, and no power of interfering with the domestic concerns of any state having been thus conceded, the whole jurisdiction respecting the continuation of domestic negro slavery, the management and the emancipation of slaves, remains solely and exclusively in the legislature of each particular state; and neither the general congress, nor the legislature of any other state, has any right or power of interference, directly or indirectly, therein. Some of the states in which slavery existed to a limited extent, have been able gradually to abolish it; others feel that as yet they cannot attempt it; whilst some are deliberating upon the propriety and practicability of the abolition. On this question it may be laid down as a maxim, that no greater moral evil could be brought upon any country than the introduction of slavery; but it is a very different question, whether in a state, which has the misfortune of having been, for a long series of years, under the infliction of such a calamity, an immediate or indiscriminate emancipation would be safe, practicable, or beneficial. This is to be decided, not by theory and specula-

tion, but by a close study of the peculiar circumstances of each place, considered in itself. Without entering into any discussion of the question, the writer of these pages would say, that one in which it is more difficult to arrive at a satisfactory practical solution has never presented itself to his mind. He will therefore content himself with stating all that is necessary for his present purpose, and upon which no question can be raised. No one can reasonably look to a very speedy removal of this evil from the southern states of America; yet no labouring people upon the face of the globe have, comparatively speaking, less severe tasks, or greater physical comforts. The general treatment of the negroes in the diocess of Charleston is kind and affectionate; far, very far more so than that of the bulk of Irish, agricultural or other labourers. The owner who would treat his slave unkindly or cruelly, would not be sustained by public opinion, and nothing would sink a man more in public estimation than the character of a cruel master. The extensive planters employ overseers, who superintend their plantations, though the owner himself is generally, as often as he conveniently can, with his overseer, and amongst his slaves. In sickness they have the best medical attendance; and the mistress will not consider that she does her duty, unless she superintends the nurse of her servants, and sees that there is no neglect. It must be conceded, that possibly there is some self-interest urging to all this kindness and attention; yet there is also much genuine benevolence and great affection for their dependants, which renders the ladies of the South more amiable in their discharge of this duty, than they generally receive credit for, from those to whom they are not known. Thus, though the negroes cannot look forward to freedom, yet they know no want, have no fear for dereliction in old age, never anticipate any destitution for their children. He is not broken down by labour, and can easily procure several of the comforts of physical existence; seldom, very seldom will he be under a tyrant, though he must always live under discipline, and be conscious of his inferiority. It is a state of things which should never be created, but which, when existing, cannot be easily removed.

In the cities and towns there are, of course, professional men, most of whom are well educated, and several of whom are owners of plantations; merchants and shop-keepers are persons of the same description as those in Europe; and a large number of them are Europeans: the principal tradesmen or merchants rank perhaps higher than persons of the same occupations do in Europe; but the great bulk of the operatives are either free negroes or slaves: the house servants are, almost without exception, coloured persons, principally slaves.

The slaves in cities and towns are generally at full liberty to join what church they please, but are encouraged to regular habits of attendance, and the galleries of the churches are generally allotted to the free negroes and to them. On the plantations the customs vary; some owners permit the attendance of their slaves at the places of worship in their neighbourhood; some masters will permit one of the negroes to officiate for the others, and sometimes even to preach; some will invite clergymen of one denomination to instruct them, and some will not allow such visits. Upon this subject each owner acts as he thinks proper.

The great body of the slaves are, in one way or other, however, attached either to the Methodists or Baptists; some of them are Presbyterians, fewer still Protestant Episcopalians; and only in the city of Charleston and a few towns, and on a very few plantations, perhaps from eight hundred to a thousand are Roman Catholics; of these latter, the greater number are they who came from Maryland or from St. Domingo, or their descendants. The negroes who arrived from the West Indies, generally speak the Creole French, which, added to the imperfection of their pronunciation, renders it a task of no small difficulty to understand them; they, however, in general, now comprehend English, or as they call it, "American;" but when they attempt to speak it, their phrases, their idiom, and their pronunciation make it more like some one of the dialects of Yorkshire or Cornwall, than the ordinary English language, such as might be learned from Walker, Johnson, or Webster. Several of the Catholic slaves are extremely well instructed, and pious; they are fond of entering little sodalities of devotion, and assembling in the afternoon in the church for prayer and singing; they also have great charity in assisting each other in time of sickness or distress, not only with temporal aid, if it be required, but by spiritual reading, prayer, and consolation: they are exceedingly attentive to have the funeral of an associate respectably attended, and not only to have the offices of the church performed, but to continue the charity of prayer for a considerable time after death, for the repose of the souls of their friends.

There are very few Indians within the limits of the diocess of Charleston; the Creeks who dwelt in Georgia having by successive cessions given up their lands, and retired beyond the Chattahoochie into their reserves in Alabama; and the Cherokees being about to retire with the Creeks, also to lands granted them beyond the Mississippi, in exchange for those which they hold in Georgia; no Catholic missionaries have ever been amongst these tribes, as there was never even a sufficient number to administer in the South the sacraments to the Catholics or

to meet the calls of the whites who desired instruction. The Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, have several missionaries amongst them; and in many instances have organized small congregations, and undertaken the education of their children, the means being supplied chiefly from the funds placed at the disposal of the American Board of Missions, by the liberality of the several Protestant churches and individuals. These funds are very considerable, and support great numbers of missionaries of the several Protestant denominations not only amongst the Indians, but also to go around amongst the negroes, and even to the whites in the newly settled regions.

Latterly, the Presbyterians, who have several theological schools in the northern states, have one which promises to be well supported in Columbia, South Carolina. The Baptists and Methodists are also well supported in this respect, and the Protestant Episcopalians are very respectably provided for. From what has been previously shown, the great wealth of the South is in the hands of the members of these denominations—the Catholics are only straggling, scattered and comparatively few; the entire number in the whole diocess is little, if anything over ten thousand souls.

The writer of this memoir would indeed be ungrateful if he did not remark, that whatever the mistakes regarding his religion might be, and whatever the efforts which many of his religious opponents might have considered it their duty to make for the purpose of counteracting his exertions, no person could have experienced more urbanity, hospitality, and respectful attention than he has received in all parts of the diocess, from all descriptions of its population; and in very many instances they who differed widely from him in doctrine and discipline, have afforded to him facilities for the discharge of his religious duties, to a very considerable extent; and in a manner highly gratifying to his feelings and complimentary to himself. Nor is it to himself alone this attention has been paid; scarcely one of the priests whom he has sent upon missions through the country, but has, upon his return, given similar testimony as to his own treatment. After several years experience, after having been in twenty-one states of the Union, in every description of society; in the city and in the forest, from the table of the President to the hut of the Indian; and having proclaimed the doctrines of his church in the halls of legislation, in the courts of justice, in the churches of those who opposed it, in the crowded steamboats of the Mississippi, and in the woods of Kentucky, to every description of hearers, he feels it a solemn duty to declare his conviction, that whatever he may feel to be their doctrinal mistakes, the American people are most religiously dis-

posed, and most inclined of all others that he has met with, to treat with courtesy and kindness every well-conducted clergyman that goes amongst them. They will generally hear him with attention, and if they cannot coincide in his views, their difference will be exhibited without any contumelious expression. Undoubtedly there are exceptions from this general statement; but it will, perhaps, be often found that the fault originated rather on the side of the preacher than that of the hearer. The view, then, which it is desired to give, as a general conclusion, is, that strong prejudices exist against the Catholic religion in several of the states, particularly in the South, by reason of the mistakes as to its tenets and principles; yet that the greatest kindness is shown to its clergy, even by the great bulk of those who labour under these mistakes.

Before quitting this topic, justice demands that another observation should be made. The peculiar situation of these colonies whilst under the British dominion, and of the states since the declaration of their independence, gave little opportunity for the correction of that evil of which there is complaint; their accounts of the Catholic religion were all derived from English sources; and everybody knows what Great Britain has done to misrepresent our religion; the situation and differences and quarrels of the Catholics were often such, as for many years to produce no favourable impression; the clergy who sometimes were allowed to officiate, were, owing to the difficulties of the place, men whose conduct gave no edification. How then could it be expected that those mistakes could be corrected? It would, indeed, be no pleasing task to bring back, even to the memory, the recollection of many an afflicting scene. The description should never be written. Under circumstances such as these, great allowances ought to be made; probably the conviction and feeling of the writer will be best conveyed in the language which he had the honour of addressing to the most respectable body before which he had ever the felicity to appear.

"Neither my own feelings, nor my judgment, nor my faith, would dictate to me anything calculated to embitter the feelings of those who differ from me—merely for that difference. My kindest friends, my most intimate acquaintance, they whom I do and ought to esteem and respect, are at variance with my creed; yet it does not and shall not destroy our affections. In me it would be ingratitude; for I must avow, and I do it most willingly, that in my journeys through our states I have been frequently humbled and abashed at the kindness with which I have been treated. I came amongst you a stranger, and I went through your land with many and most serious and unfortunate mistakes, for which you were not blamable, operating to my disadvantage.

If a Roman Catholic bishop were, in truth, what he is even now generally supposed to be in various parts of this Union, he should not be permitted to reside amongst you; yet was I received into your houses, enrolled in your families, and profited by your kindness. I have frequently put the question to myself, whether, if I had similar impressions regarding you, I could have acted\with the like kindness; and I must own, I frequently doubted that I would. It is true, you laboured under serious mistakes as to what was my religion, and what were my duties and obligations. But you were not yourselves the authors of those mistakes; nor had you within your reach the means of correcting them. I feel grateful to my friends who have afforded me this opportunity of perhaps aiding to do away these impressions; for our affections will be more strong as those mistakes will be corrected; and it must gratify those, who, loving the country, behold us spread through it, to be assured, that we are not those vile beings that have been painted to their imaginations, and which ought not to be allowed existence in any civilized community."

"I feel that many and serious mistakes are made by my friends in this country. I know who are mistaken, but far be it from me to say that all who err are criminal. I have frequently asked myself, whether, if I had only the same opportunities of knowing the doctrine of my church, and its evidences, that many of them have had, I would be what I know I am. Indeed, it would be very extraordinary if I were. They labour under these mistakes, not through their own fault in several instances; and if the Roman Catholic Church were, in her doctrines and practices, what they have been taught she is, I would not be a Roman Catholic. They imagine her to be what she is not, and when they oppose what they believe her to be, it is not to her their opposition is really given." [76]

Whilst such are the convictions and feelings of him who makes the present exposition, he owes it to truth and to religion, also plainly to say, that owing to those causes, there are serious difficulties, which perpetually impede and harass the Catholic missionary, and which oppress and affiict, and worry the Catholic emigrant. They both have the full protection of an equality of law, but neither of them has the full protection of religious sympathy. As the writer believes that facts always speak better than descriptions, he will mention a few, to convey more clearly the idea he would communicate.

[76] Substance of a discourse preached by the Right Reverend John England, D. D., Bishop of Charleston, in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, in the city of Washington, before the Congress of the United States, on Sunday, January 8th, 1826.

About a year since, the President nominated to office the present Attorney-General of the United States, who is a good practical Catholic. His most virulent opponent could find no vulnerable spot in his character; yet was the chief magistrate of the Union violently assailed by the greater portion of the sectarian presses, for giving office to "a Papist." Transitions from one church to another are of frequent occurrence; and it often happens that the members of one family will profess three or four different religions; this will seldom cause any unkind feeling between them, unless the conversion should be to the Catholic Church; in such a case it will generally happen that the convert must be prepared for the endurance of an unusual trial. There are probably eight weekly, or other periodical publications, belonging to the different sectaries throughout the Union; they will occasionally bicker with each other, but seldom with an acrimonious spirit; yet there are very few that are not habitually virulent against Catholics and their religion. They, on this topic, forget even the ordinary courtesies of polished society, and descend to the scurrility of nicknames—"Papist"—"Popery"—"Romish"—"Babylon;" and "the tinge of scarlet" is to be found, not upon the cheek of the writer, where it should be, but with all its appendages, in coarse language, before the eye of even his female reader.

It, however, is to be hoped, and indeed expected, from the inquiring character, and the honest purposes of the American mind, that there will be an early termination to this unpleasant and unbecoming conduct, and that after a time, no person will be found to estimate his sanctity by his vulgarity, or to conceive that he is more acceptable to the Creator, as he is more offensive to his creature. In the tracts, which are plentifully distributed, there is too much of this style to pass unnoticed, and the agents of the Bible Society, and the tract distributers, who are exceedingly numerous, are really under the impression that Catholics are idolators, and that Catholics reject the Bible, because they will not purchase or accept as the whole word of God, the imperfect copies from which, what Protestants style the Apocrypha are excluded; nor believe that the translation is good and perfect, nor admit the principle that each single individual is more competent than the united authority of Christendom, to tell what was always from the beginning, the meaning of each and every text of the sacred volume. Time, patience, investigation, charity, and explanation, however, are making their natural improvements in this respect.

From the view that has been given, it cannot be expected that the diocess of Charleston is in a very flourishing condition. After a great variety of difficulties, it is, however, in a state of organization. Some

years since, the bishop, and priests, and people, came to a full and explicit understanding as to their respective rights and duties, according to the discipline of the church, and the peculiar circumstances of the place; this was embodied in a written form, denominated the "Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church" of each state contained in the diocess; in it are found such regulations as will, it is trusted, prevent any collision; they have hitherto preserved peace, harmony, and affection. Thus there is no likelihood of a recurrence of those unhappy discords that have done so much evil in this church.

In the city of Charleston there is a fine lot of ground, upon which are some old buildings occupied as a seminary, in which the clergy now in the diocess, have been educated; about four hundred books have been collected, as the commencement of a library; contributions to this are exceedingly desirable. The bishop believes that he has secured that a sufficient supply of good candidates for the ministry can be henceforth supplied, but it is absolutely necessary that there should be some aid for them during their period of preparation and study. This seminary has, during years, been greatly embarrassed by an accumulation of debt and interest, but it has been relieved by the generous contributions of France and Germany. It is necessary to procure a more suitable building for the accommodation of the priests and students; means are wanted for this. There is upon this ground a temporary wooden church as a cathedral; it is eighty feet long, by forty-eight wide; it is desirable to erect a larger building with more solid and permanent materials; two priests officiate in this church, which is called St. Finnbar's, and two in St. Mary's, which is the old brick building previously noticed. The number of communicants last Easter, in both, was upwards of six hundred, several of whom were not originally Catholics. There is also, at a considerable distance from both these churches, a burying ground, the cemetery of St. Patrick, upon which it would be desirable to have a church erected for the accommodation of several who are far removed from the other churches.

A congregation of Sisters of our Lady of Mercy has been formed within three years, and has at present ten sisters, who have made annual vows; they reside near the cathedral, in a house for which they pay a high rent: the object of their institution is, to educate females of the middling classes of society, also to have a school for free coloured girls, and to give religious instruction to female slaves; they will also devote themselves to the service of the sick; and they have been very useful in the management of the seminary. The bishop has also lately purchased, near the cathedral, a house and garden for some Ursuline

nuns, who will go with him upon his return. For all these objects, much is needed.

In South Carolina, there is also a priest stationed at Columbia, which is the seat of government, 110 miles from Charleston, about the centre of the state; this priest has to perform several laborious journeys on distant missions. A fine brick church has been erected here under the invocation of St. Peter; but it is greatly involved in debt, and the congregation is altogether unable to extricate it from its difficulties; they are nearly altogether Irish settlers. The ground over which the pastor of Columbia has been in the habit of travelling, would occupy three missionaries; but they would need aid besides what they could obtain in their districts. All the other religious denominations have several missionaries of this description, whom they support by subscription and contributions. The Catholics are the only religious body who are without this aid.

Two other small wooden churches are in process of erection; one at Barnwell, on the road from Charleston to Augusta, and one on the road from Charleston to Savannah, which are for the accommodation of a number of Irish settlers in these districts, and upon whom it would be exceedingly onerous to support a missionary. There are four or five other places in the state in which small congregations might be formed if the means of erecting small churches and serving them for a time could be had.

In North Carolina, the Catholics of Washington, in Beaufort county, have, by considerable exertion, built a good wooden church under the invocation of St. John the Evangelist. There being not more than eight or ten families that can contribute, they have not been able to finish the interior. A priest officiates for them every alternate month; he spends the other month in the adjoining county of Craven, at Newbern, where there are a few Catholics, a number of whom are converts; they have a fine piece of ground, and some means to erect a church, but cannot commence until they are aided.

In the same state, there is a church at Fayetteville, under the invocation of St. Patrick; the ground and a former church were given by an individual, but the church was destroyed in a conflagation which consumed nearly all the town. The Catholics of several parts of the United States sent subscriptions to help the rebuilding of the church, but they have not been sufficient. The priest who serves the few Catholics here spends a portion of his time upon missions, about 120 miles west of this station, in the counties of Lincoln and Mecklenburg, where there are several Irish Catholics, some of whom are employed in the gold mines.

They are anxious to erect a church, but have not the means. There are four or five other stations in this state, where the ministry would be very necessary. Amongst them is the town of Wilmington, the most frequented, as the port upon the Cape Fear River, and probably the principal harbour of this state, to which several Catholics occasionally resort, and which is never without some Catholic inhabitants, generally natives of Ireland.

In Georgia, the congregation at Savannah has had a regular pastor: the number probably amounts to five hundred; their church is old and tottering, and they are endeavouring to raise the funds to erect one better suited to their numbers and their worship. In Augusta, though the congregation is not as numerous as at Savannah, yet their church is far too small; they also have a regular pastor. The congregation at Locust Grove, about sixty miles above Augusta, has greatly increased, chiefly by Irish settlers; their church was, about eight years since, taken down, and a good wooden church of framework erected in place of the original log building. The Legislature of Georgia, at its last session, passed two acts, one incorporating the Catholics in Columbus, a new town laid off on the Chattahoochie river, nearly two hundred miles west of Augusta, in Muscogee county, one of a number of new counties lately created, in land ceded by the Creek Indians, about four years since: the other granting them a lot of land in the town, upon which to build their church. The bishop had previously organized them, and advised them to petition for those favours. The few Irish Catholics there have endeavoured to collect the means of raising the building, but have not as yet succeeded. The bishop trusts upon his return, to be able to send a priest to this district. In this region there are a considerable number of Irish Catholics spread through an immense extent, whom a priest endeavours to see once in the year; and the bishop never has had more gratification than in an excursion of two months, doing duty amongst them; separated from each other by fifty or a hundred miles, the families have congregated to the stations where he fixed to meet them, that they might hear his voice, and receive the sacraments. He does not think he goes farther than he is warranted by facts, when he states that in Georgia, six or seven places would require churches, and the attendance of a clergyman. The present number of priests in the diocess is eleven. Three or four students are pursuing their studies, and he has received ten candidates since his arrival in Ireland; so that if he had some pecuniary assistance, he trusts that ere long the forlorn emigrant, who now wanders, far from kindred and country, through this immense tract, seeking for sustenance and settlements, would have at

least the opportunity of worshipping, even if it were in the midst of the forest, at the altar of his fathers.

Besides the above view, the writer would add, that during upwards of ten years, he and his associates have, at a serious pecuniary loss, not to mention immense labour, published a weekly paper, the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, in which the cause of Ireland at home, and Irishmen abroad, and of the Catholic religion through the world, has been defended to the best of their ability. This paper is published every week on a large sheet of eight pages, containing twenty-four columns of letter press, in the city of Charleston, and has now reached the twelfth volume.

The compiler of this account trusts that they who read it, will feel how meritorious and useful an application of alms it would be, to afford to such a diocess that temporary aid which would enable it to emerge from its difficulties, and in its turn communicate to others from the results of benefits bestowed upon itself.

MOTHER MARY CHARLES MOLONY,

FIRST SUPERIORESS OF THE URSULINE CONVENT, IN CHARLESTON, S. C.

[This biographical sketch of the first Superioress of the Ursuline Nuns, of Charleston, now removed from that city, and established at Cincinnati, Ohio, was published as a pamphlet, soon after the death of Mother Mary Charles, A. D. 1839.]

The subject of this brief memoir was the youngest daughter of Francis Molony, Esq., a large landholder in the county of Cork, and for some time an eminent merchant in the city; and who had been able notwithstanding the cruel and plundering code which stripped so many of the ancient Irish families of their property, unless they would preserve it by the loss of their religion, to retain a portion of the first and to keep the second in its full integrity.

His youngest daughter, Christina, was born on the 17th of September, 1785, in the Castle of Macroom, where her parents then resided. She had nine elder sisters, two of whom, now dead, were married to eminent lawyers. One, at present a widow, married a highly respectable physician; another was married to an extensive planter in Jamaica, where she resided with him for several years, but he having foreseen the occurrences which have since taken place, long before the agitation became serious, disposed of his property and purchased estates in Ireland, where he and his family reside. Another sister called, like herself, to the service of God in the performance of monastic duties, survives her in the convent over which she presided. The others died when young. Of her brothers—two died young. One, who resided in Jamaica and married there, died many years since; another about two years since departed this life, leaving to his family a considerable property in lands in the counties of Cork and of Tipperary. Another survives, who has preferred the shades of retirement to mixing in the bustle of busy life. But there was a period when the writer of this sketch witnessed and appreciated his exertions and sacrifices for the protection of his country, and the defence of his religion. It was that day in which Ireland had the misfortune of being the prey of a triumvirate that sought to blast every hope of freedom for the Catholic, or of prosperity for the land. Lord Manners held the seals, Sir Robert Peel was Chief Secretary, and the Right Hon. William Saurin was Attorney-General. It

was decreed to crush every patriot, to put down every public meeting, to silence the press, and to ruin, by aggravated costs and by long imprisonment, every one who dared to publish the misdeeds of an ascendency of oligarchs. And in that evil day Mr. Francis Molony gave largely from his purse, strenuously contributed by his exertions, and exposed himself to persecution for the purpose of defeating the unholy alliance. The efforts of those who, in that time of terror, bore the brunt of the battle, have not been unsuccessful. Great concessions have been obtained, and many who have greatly contributed to achieve the victory, have subsequently withdrawn from posts which no longer needed their exertions. Amongst them was this gentleman, a brief digression for whose services may be allowed to a companion and a friend.

Christina received an excellent education, which was perfected by a residence of several years, as a boarder, under the tuition of the ladies of the Ursuline Convent of the city of Cork—which for a long period has borne the reputation of being an excellent house of female education. Her proficiency in this asylum of learning and of virtue, was not merely in worldly lore, and transitory accomplishments, but she was deeply imbued with the true spirit of genuine religion and the solid science of the saints; she had the advantage and happiness of being guided in her practices by a priest of the most simple piety, the best common sense, and exceedingly accurate knowledge of the principles and practice of true devotion: the Very Rev. Robert McCarthy, then Dean of Cork, and previously Rector of the Irish College at Toulouse, whence he had to migrate on foot and nearly destitute of food, into Spain, to escape the fury of the desecrators of liberty and of religion at the period of the first infidel revolution of France.

During some years which elapsed between the completion of her education and her return to the convent as a Postulant, she used his ministry and sought his counsels whenever she was in the city.

She had secretly cherished the desire and hope of consecrating herself to the service of God in a religious state, for years before she openly expressed that desire; she made it the subject for frequent prayer to the Most High, that he would direct her to that state of life in which she could best conform to his will and serve him with fidelity.

Her widowed sister had, after her husband's death, devoted herself almost exclusively to the instruction of the ignorant, and was much occupied in works of mercy to the sick and the poor. These works she performed under the guidance of the brother of her deceased husband, a most zealous, learned, and exemplary prelate, the Right Rev. Florence McCarthy, Rector of the parish of St. Finnbarr and its adjacents,

and coadjutor bishop to the venerated Doctor Moylan, then Bishop of Cork. In those duties of charity Christina was frequently her voluntary associate. Thus, without any singular appearance of abstaining from those innocent enjoyments becoming her age and place in society, she was in the habit of cultivating an intimate union with God by secret prayer, of serving him by doing works of mercy, and of sanctifying herself by the use of sacraments.

Previous to her father's death, in the year 1808, she obtained the consent of both her parents to offer herself as a candidate for admission into their order, to the ladies by whom she had been educated; and after the usual probation and noviciate, she pronounced her solemn vows, and received the black veil on the festival of St. Francis Borgia, the 10th of October, in the year 1811.

She looked upon herself as now dead to the world and separated from all its concerns, save whatever charge her superiors might assign to her in that little world which was still to be found within the walls of her monastery, where upwards of sixty young ladies, placed as boarders by their friends to receive the best education, and where about 200 female children of persons in humble circumstances, were daily received in a separate school to be gratuitously instructed in the rudiments of literature, the great truths of religion, and the industrious pursuits so necessary for their sphere of life.

In so large a community as was that of Cork, then having upwards of forty members, the great object of the rule was easily attained, viz., to allow the newly professed sisters abundant time for spiritual exercises; so that by prayer, meditation, study of the holy Scriptures and works of piety, they might, at an early period, make great progress in the science of the saints, and having fully learned to devote themselves unreservedly to the service of God, and to seek in all things his glory and the salvation of souls they might with greater security extend their charity to their neighbour, and love God in those children whom they were to train up in the pursuit of virtue and of eternal life. Sister Mary Charles, as she was now called in religion, entered fully into the spirit of her state, and sought in the will of her superiors to discover the will of her God, and bowed to their directions as to the expressed mandate of her Lord, seeking, by this manifestation of obedience, to become more assimilated to him who was obedient even unto death. From him also she endeavoured to learn meekness and humility of heart.

She not only possessed a great fund of knowledge, but an uncommon facility of imparting it, and was greatly pleased with the occupation of teaching; hence, at a comparatively early period she was placed

in charge of the classes. Though her time was greatly occupied—as her regular duties required, between choir and school, generally almost fifteen hours of daily attention—she asked and obtained permission to devote a couple of hours to private study. She was intimately conversant with the French language, and had a good knowledge of the Italian; but she felt a great want, by reason of not having regularly learned the Latin language, and the supply of this became her first object. She began methodically, and in a few months she had so perfectly overcome every difficulty, that she found as much facility in reading prose or poetry in the old authors, as in reading the English translations. She next extended her reading to several works of science, by means of which she might be better able to direct the studies of her pupils, and give them more ample explanation.

It would not be easy to find in any one community of religious, or association of any description, a greater number of ladies of superior talent, of more cultivated minds, and of more refined taste, than could then be met with in the Ursuline Community of Cork. It was delightful to witness the manner in which they, by a united effort, in a short time extended and multiplied the opportunities for improvement in their schools, and created and sustained in their pupils a generous rivalry without envy, and a desire to succeed, without displeasure at disappointment. The writer has often witnessed it with deep feelings of gratification, and admired the manner in which such a spirit was preserved—and amidst the laborious and happy group whose exertions were crowned with such success, Sister Mary Charles had a conspicuous place.

They who at a distance read the history of Irish transactions, are generally unable to form correct opinions respecting the facts that come under their view. They too often draw their conclusions from circumstances which have as little to do with the state of Ireland as they do with those of China, and which they notwithstanding bring to enter into the case. Thus, it would indeed be a very strange and unbecoming exhibition to behold the sisters of our American convents taking a deep interest in the questions whether it would be better policy for the general government to manage its own money concerns, or to have them managed by bankers, and instilling into the minds of their pupils lessons concerning the patriotism of Henry Clay, of Daniel Webster, of General Harrison, of John C. Calhoun. The religious community amongst us, which would so far forget its place, would quickly and deservedly lose the confidence and the esteem of the people. And for this plain reason: they had no concern with party politics; the questions at issue did not specially

concern them. In Ireland, at the period about to be brought under view, it was not so.

A partial relaxation of the penal code took place in 1779. The Ursuline community had been privately established in Cork a few years before: the Protestant corporation of that city, filled with a spirit approximating to that which pervades Massachusetts, deliberated upon the project of driving them out;—and it was only by greater efforts at concealment that they were able to remain. A farther relaxation of this nefarious code took place in 1793. In 1799 promises were solemnly made to the Catholics, that if they consented to a union with Great Britain, the remaining portion of this law of persecution should be blotted out. The union was agreed to: the persecution was not only continued, but the bigotry of England and of Scotland was invoked to aid the Orangemen sent to misrepresent Ireland in the Imperial Parliament, and the Irish Protestant-ascendency men were exerting themselves to the utmost to deprive of their seats the few representatives from Ireland, who demanded justice for the Catholics. It was at this period that the Catholics resolved, by a combined effort, not to have recourse to any insurrection, which would be their ruin and the destruction of their country, but to excite the public mind to form a union of moral strength and energy, and to sustain those men who, within the walls of Parliament, claimed from Britain those rights which force, and fraud, and bigotry had combined to withhold from Catholic Ireland. The professor of the Catholic religion was persecuted for adherence to the altars of his fathers, and Ireland was enslaved because she was Catholic. It was the duty of all Irish Catholics, without distinction of sex, or age, or condition, to use their best efforts, in the case of a contest for the representation of a city, or county, or borough in Ireland, to sustain the advocate of their cause, who was also the martyr to their country.

It was at this period that Sir Robert Peel was selected to be one of the chief agents in sacrificing Catholic Ireland to the party of Protestant ascendency:—and never, to the knowledge of the writer of this memoir, did any man sent upon such a mission more strenuously endeavour to fulfil his task!

From one end of Ireland to the other, the Catholics determined to make all sacrifices to prevent the ruin which was impending. And the good daughters of St. Ursula were not backward amidst their brethren. Their ample hall frequently was filled with the crowds of patriots, whom they invited to accompany the leading orators and senators whom they requested to come thither, that from the children entrusted to their care they may, in music, and in song, and in innocent festivity, receive a

small portion of that tribute which gratitude delights to pay to the protector of the oppressed, to the friend of his country. The peculiar position of Sister Mary Charles made it her duty to aid in impressing upon the minds of the pupils those facts of history and principles of right which not only justified but required the course they were pursuing. In after days, when the battle raged more fiercely, the pupil impressed upon the mind of her brother and of her husband the lessons she had thus learned. The public meetings were graced and animated by the presence of ladies thus well instructed, and fully prepared to influence those men who had to contend for their religion and their rights. The good sisters who imparted such information and inculcated such sentiments, though they lived in the seclusion of the monastery, had no small share in the protection of their church and the regeneration of their country. And to her latest moments of existence, the subject of this memoir felt grateful for the part which she had in this useful occupation.

About the year 1818, upon the request of the Archbishop of Cashel and the Ursuline community of Thurles, in the county of Tipperary, two sisters were sent from the house in Cork, to impart the improvements that had been introduced, and which gave celebrity to their schools. On this occasion Sister Mary Charles accompanied thither Sister Mary Ursula (Mrs. Young), a lady of untiring zeal, great talent, and eminent virtue. This latter sister was the compiler of a catechism of Irish history, then taught to the pupils, and which was the cause of great displeasure to the party of the ascendency, for it was written in a style provokingly wicked in their view, because, in her usual manner of conveying as much knowledge of facts as possible in plain language, suitable to the capacity of children, it did indeed tell a great deal more truth than it was fashionable to print, or gratifying to the persecutors to have published. Some persons did the writer of this memoir the honour of attributing it to his pen, and a prosecution was contemplated. It was also brought under view of the Imperial Parliament; and a dissenting clergyman deliberately swore before a committee of the house that it was compiled by him.

This sister subsequently compiled a history of the United Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, which is used in the schools of the monastery, and extensively read at the other side of the Atlantic. The object was to restore to history its proper place, and not to have it debased to be the vehicle of calumny against Catholics.

After remaining a couple of years at the convent of Thurles, the two sisters returned to Cork, gratified at witnessing the beneficial results

of their sojourn, and carrying with them the gratitude of their sisters and of the archbishop.

The regularity of her conduct, her judgment and piety, pointed out Sister Mary Charles, after her return, as well calculated to lead novices into the paths of perfection; and she for some years fulfilled the duties of this arduous office equally to the satisfaction of the superiors of the community, as of those over whom she was in charge; and whilst she won their hearts to God, she infused into them that spirit of holy zeal which warmed them to the desire of spending and being spent for the sake of God, and cheered them in their trials.

She had also opportunities of exhibiting to them in her own conduct a spirit of holy resignation and cheerfulness in suffering; for her health became impaired, and she occasionally endured violent pain, which she said was to her a warning of the transitory state of our present life, and the necessity of being always prepared for a summons to the bar of judgment. She was not known to complain, though she was frequently confined for days, and sometimes weeks, and sought to unite her spirit on such occasions with that of her suffering Saviour.

Her taste for music was exquisite, her knowledge of its theory extensive, and her performance accurate, judicious, and easy; to which was added a voice of sweet tone and extensive compass. She contributed much to the admired performances in the chapel of their convent, in which, it was acknowledged by excellent judges, the music was of a chaste, sublime, and melting character.

Thus gifted, faithful, and useful, had God vouchsafed to grant her a continuance of health, it may be fairly calculated that during a long series of years she would decorate religion and lead many to the service of their Creator. And when application was made for a filiation from the house near Cork, to found a monastery in Charleston, and that it was determined to give a good and efficient colony, she was immediately regarded as one of those from amongst whom its first superior should be selected.

The territory comprised in the two Carolinas and Georgia was in 1820 separated from the see of Baltimore, and placed under the administration of a new see, created in Charleston, suffragan to Baltimore. The newly appointed bishop had long known the value of the Ursuline community to the diocess of Cork, of which he was a priest; and from the moment of his appointment was anxious, if possible, to extend its benefits to his own diocess at the earliest period. But upon his arrival in Charleston he found the new field of his labour in a most destitute state. There were on the mission only two priests, and they were deter-

mined to leave the South as soon as they could: one departed after a few months, the other was kind enough to remain upwards of two years. Difficulty after difficulty was surmounted; and at length, in 1832, the bishop saw the prospect of being able to introduce a colony. He was enabled, by charitable aid from various sources, to purchase the site which he considered most eligible for his object, and then wrote to Ireland to request that he might be favoured with a colony to commence the establishment. The answer gave hope. Having occasion to go to Europe for a variety of purposes, and this amongst others, he was assured that in a short time his request would be granted, though the labours and duties of the community were very great in proportion to their numbers. In 1834, he returned again to Europe; and as no member of the community could be required to go upon another establishment without her own full consent, the ladies thought fit for the Charleston mission were consulted. Sister Mary Charles deferred giving her answer until after she should have consulted with Doctor England. On that occasion she represented to him her fear that, if he consented to her going, he would be disappointed, as she had neither the same vigour of mind or body that he probably might imagine from his former acquaintance with her, and she pointed out others whom she considered better fitted to preside over a new establishment. She had, she said, suffered much of late in her health, but had no reluctance to leave her country, her friends and her community, if she thought she might be more useful in promoting the glory of God in another region,—though she felt herself bound in honour and in conscience to advise him to make a better choice. The bishop stated that he appreciated her motives, knew her qualities, and would be quite happy should she be appointed, and requested that she should leave herself altogether in the hands of the community, believing that God would direct all things for the best. After this she informed the superioress that she was at the disposal of the chapter, to go or to remain, as they might determine; and in a few days the mission was named, viz., Mother Mary Charles, Mrs. Maria Borgia M'Carthy, her neice, daughter of her eldest sister, and Mrs. Mary Antonia Hughes, lately professed, sister to the present Bishop of Gibraltar. They were to be accompanied, at her own request, by Miss H. Woulfe, as a postulant, since professed in Charleston. They left the convent on the 27th of September, and passing a day with the nuns of the Presentation Convent in Cork, where the bishop's sister had long been, they departed from the city on the 29th, and passing through Waterford, to see their sisters of the Usurline community in that city, they proceeded through Kilkenny and Carlow to Dublin, and thence to Liverpool, where they em-

barked for Philadelphia; and after visiting the sisters at Emmettsburgh, at Georgetown, and Baltimore, they arrived in Charleston, and entered their monastery on the 10th of December.

Previous to their leaving Ireland, the ladies were fully aware of the cruel treatment their sisters had received from the Protestants of Massachusetts; and the bishop told them that if they felt any reluctance to come to the United States, because of this outrage, he begged they should not consider themselves under any obligations; for much as he desired their aid, he would be far from seeking it at the expense of their feelings. Mother Mary Charles spoke for them, in saying, that when they had devoted themselves to the service of God, they never regarded difficulty or danger in such a way as to turn them from the performance of a duty. Besides that, they had heard that in South Carolina there was less bigotry, more high sense of honour, and a better spirit of chivalry than in Massachusetts; but even were it to Charlestown, instead of Charleston, that they were sent, they would not be deterred by the knowledge that its people had acted a brutal part, and that its public authorities had connived at their delinquency. Her mind was exceedingly firm: the expressions she thus used were the true exhibition of her sentiments, as her whole conduct through life proved; and the writer is persuaded that few women would in the midst of difficulties exhibit more unquailing fortitude, or in the face of danger show more calm and steady courage.

Another exhibition of her character took place in Philadelphia. Bishop Kenrick, to whose generous hospitality during their stay in that city much is due, was himself greatly struck with the fitness of the little colony for the work it had undertaken. He was urgently pressed by some of his clergy and laity, who had opportunities of forming a judgment, and still further confirmed in his opinion by the reports of some highly respectable persons, who had been passengers in the same vessel with the nuns. Thinking only of his own diocess, and urged by the suggestions of others, as well as by his own wishes, he seriously undertook to prevail on the Bishop of Charleston to prefer the welfare of another district to his own, and to allow the colony to remain at Philadelphia. When Mother Mary Charles was consulted upon it, her answer was, that she was ready to obey, either by proceeding to Charleston, or by remaining in Philadelphia; for that her object was to perform her duty, in whatever region she might be placed; and that, during the few days of her sojourn on earth, it was to her matter of little concern on what spot of it she was placed, if by the service of God she could, through the merits of her Saviour, obtain a seat in heaven. This dis-

engagement was on her part in the perfect spirit of her state; but the Bishop of Charleston considered that it would be on his part a very wanton betraying of the trust reposed in him, to cast away from the most indigent diocess in the Union the germ of its future fruit, in favour of one possessing the ample resources of Philadelphia.

Soon after the arrival of the colony in Charleston, the Catholics waited upon the little community, to congratulate it upon its arrival, and to tender their services.

Few are aware of the difficulties which necessarily attend the formation of a new religious establishment; but they who do, will feel that much prudence and many other virtues are required in its superioress, even where the other individuals are, as they of Charleston were, deeply imbued with the spirit of their state, zealous for the attainment of their common object, well qualified for their undertaking, and attached to their superior.

She and they prudently determined to keep as much as possible from placing their establishment conspicuously before the public, from attracting attention, or creating expectations—but in the quiet and seclusion of their house, to devote themselves to the care of such children as might be entrusted to their charge. She specially exhorted them and herself, assiduously gave the example, to seek, in a particular manner, for the females who had been most neglected, and to attend to the catechetical instruction of the children. Hence she was generally to be found with the females of colour, and surrounded by the children of every hue who were preparing for their first communion. She preferred this occupation to the teaching of human science, though at the proper time she also well performed her part in giving the instruction or making the examinations in the higher classes of young ladies.

After four months' residence in Charleston, she began to suffer more frequently, and more seriously from sickness, so that indeed she may be said not to have passed a day without more or less of pain. In the intervals of comparative remission she redoubled her efforts, to try and make amends, as she said, for the time that she had lost, and the trouble that she had given.

It was judged necessary after about fifteen months, that one of the community should return to Europe in order to make some arrangements, which could not be so well effected by any other as by one who had by personal observation some knowledge of the American mission. Besides her qualifications, it was also thought that the health of the superioress might be greatly improved, perhaps re-established by the voyage, and as the bishop was obliged to go to Rome, she accompanied

him to Liverpool in the month of June, 1836. She visited Dublin, Thurles, Waterford, and Cork, and remained in her convent, near this latter city, until Doctor England returned from Italy, in the early part of November. Her health was far from being improved, and the winter climate of even the South of Ireland was too severe for her; besides, she considered Charleston as her home, and if it was the will of God to call upon her even speedily, she preferred being found at her post by the bearer of the summons.

Accompanied by her sister, whom the Cork community permitted to accompany her, and by a young lady as a postulant, she made a winter voyage across the Atlantic, and after a boisterous and somewhat tedious passage, she landed in New York on the 30th of December, just previous to the severe storms which proved fatal to so many vessels in the first week in January, 1837.

As soon as the weather would permit the packets to put to sea, she proceeded to Charleston, where she arrived before the middle of January, to the great joy of her community and of many others, and immediately devoted herself to the duties of her place.

Hopes were occasionally entertained that the causes of her illness had been removed, but they were frequently dashed by her relapses and her sufferings—under which she always preserved an admirable equanimity, and manifested an edifying spirit of resignation and penance. She regarded them as dispensations of her providential Father, who, she said, knew what was beneficial for her, and would not permit her to be tried beyond the strength which he would kindly bestow, to enable her to endure. We all, she observed, could turn his chastisements to profit, and we all deserved the inflictions of his rod for our offences. If his mercy was extended to us through the merits of his beloved Son, surely it was fit that the members should suffer when the head was crowned with thorns; and if his good will substituted affliction in this life for even the sufferings of the purgatory of the next, it was our duty to bow in submission to his decree, and to be grateful for his mercy.

She had the gratification to witness the solid establishment of her house, the progress of the work that she had commenced, and to find the first obstacles to success effectually removed, when she plainly perceived that her labours were soon to end. She requested her physician and attendants to be candid and explicit with her, when they should perceive the first symptoms of approaching death. She resigned herself to the will of God, and to the last did and suffered all that was deemed expedient, to avert the stroke that appeared to impend, or alleviate the suffering she endured.

On Tuesday, the 23d of July, at the hour of Vespers, where commemoration was made of her patroness, St. Christina, the bishop announced to her that her situation had become extremely precarious, and proposed to her to receive the holy viaticum. She received the intelligence with unmoved composure, and requested a few moments for special preparation by prayer. She had previously made her confession, not venturing, as she said, to defer so important a duty to a moment when the weight of sickness, or the confusion of the mind, might render the effort comparatively useless. Everything was prepared; her community were kneeling round her bed, in tears and in prayer; the holy sacrament was on the table, her eyes were fixed upon the image of her crucified Saviour, the attending priest was scarcely intelligible as he essayed to go through the form of confession, or to answer the bishop: the patient observed it, and, in a steady voice went through the form, and made the responses—she addressed a few words to her associates, and requested their prayers and their pardon, for any faults of neglect, or bad example on her part in their regard, and with humble confidence in the merits, in the promises, and in the sacraments of her Saviour, she received the holy eucharist.

A few moments of affecting silent intercourse with Heaven followed. She then requested that extreme unction should not be postponed, and began the form, made the responses, and aided to facilitate its administration.

She then gave herself by an act of perfect oblation into the hands of her Saviour, thanking him for the honour conferred upon her, in permitting her to have a share in beginning the good work commenced in this city, and for permitting her to die in the midst of the community that was to continue it. In a calm, and resigned, and grateful spirit, she prayed through a great portion of the night:—and continued in the same dispositions during the succeeding days.

On Saturday she was thought to be dying; and on its being announced to her, she begged and received from the bishop the last indulgence. She rallied, however, and though her mind occasionally wandered, still the wandering seemed generally to be on the borders of the pathway to heaven, and much of her conversation was with God and his saints.

On Sunday, the 28th, in the full possession of her faculties, surrounded by her dear daughters in Christ, she felt and said that the space now between her and the bar of her God was brief indeed, and she desired that they might pray together as she passed over it.

She noticed the scattering and the loss of her sight,—continued to

pray, waxed weaker and more languid,—and it was observed at a quarter before twelve at noon, just after she had been prayed for in the churches, that her soul had passed away.

When some hours afterwards her body, according to the regulations of the order, was dressed in the habit, and in her hands was placed the parchment containing her vows, which she had signed on the day of her solemn religious profession, together with a crucifix, and her head and bust so elevated, as that she appeared only reclining with her hands joined before her breast; every one who saw it observed an extraordinary expression of serene joy upon the countenance, that seemed as if in contemplation of the well-kept vows and of the emblem of redemption.

On Monday the body, now placed in a coffin, was removed to the convent chapel, and in the afternoon, the usual rites had been performed in the presence of her afflicted community and their boarders, together with the Sisters of our Lady of Mercy. It was slowly borne by six gentlemen, deputed from the three churches of the city, to a vault, hermetically closed, under the altar, and there deposited, to await the summons of the archangel.

From what has been written, her character may be easily drawn. Gifted with a fine understanding—she had the benefit of an excellent education, improved by constant and judicious study; there was no display, though uncommon erudition; good sense and a penetrating spirit enabled her almost instinctively, to form a proper estimate of character, and to decide correctly in an emergency. She was accustomed to seek advice without sacrificing her judgment, or an over-attachment to her own opinions. Habits of business and untiring industry enabled her to do much in a short time, and in an orderly manner.

Her disposition was generous, her manners affable, her love of the children entrusted to her, boundless, and hence she won their affection, as she was loved and esteemed by others who had the pleasure of her society.

Inured from her childhood to the practice of religion, thoroughly instructed in its truths, still imbibing its lessons as she advanced in life, and exerting herself to reduce them to practice, she was a model to those who approached her, whilst she always discovered in herself and lamented those imperfections which the frailty of our natures exhibit even in those who advance most towards perfection. Her zeal was tempered with discretion, and her hopes were regulated by humility. Her great object was the sanctification of herself, and to aid in bringing others to salvation through Christ Jesus. Taken away in the midst of her usefulness, when it was hoped that during many years we should profit by

her presence, she has departed not unhonoured nor unwept. Amongst the many who will weep over her grave and cherish her memory, whilst they offer prayers for her repose, is her venerable mother, now a model of patriarchal piety in the ninety-third year of her age. May her sorrow be alleviated by the hope that but a short time can elapse ere they shall be reunited for eternity, in the enjoyment of their common Redeemer, whom each has endeavoured faithfully to serve in their different walks of life—each in the way that she was called by her Creator!

"Farewell! thy life hath left surviving love
A wealth of records and sweet 'feelings given,'
From sorrow's heart the faintness to remove,
By whispers breathing 'less of earth than heaven.'

"Thus rests thy spirit still on those with whom
Thy step the path of joyous duty trod,
Bidding them make an altar of thy tomb,
Where chasten'd thought may offer praise to God!"

PART III: HISTORICAL FRAGMENTS

DENMARK

This country is a portion of that large tract formerly known by the name of Scandinavia, and was, about the close of the seventh century, known by its modern appellation.

Hume, who is certainly one of the worst authorities we know, where religion is even incidentally concerned, states that "the Emperor Charlemagne, though naturally generous and humane, had been induced, by bigotry, to exercise great severities upon the pagan Saxons in Germany, whom he had subdued; and, besides often ravaging their country with fire and sword, he had, in cool blood, decimated all the inhabitants for their revolts, and had obliged them, by the most rigorous edicts, to make a seeming compliance with the Christian doctrines."

Our object, at present, is not to examine critically how many falsehoods are contained in the paragraph which we have quoted, but we distinctly assert that it was neither religion nor bigotry that caused this monarch to exercise those severities upon the pagan Saxons, but their frequent rebellions, or, as Hume calls it, "revolts," and the perpetual guilt of persecution and plunder of Christians in their vicinity, who were his subjects, and whom he was bound by every law, human and divine, to protect. Mr. Hume frequently lays before his readers facts without stating their true cause, and many of his readers take the causes upon his authority as they find the facts generally admitted, and incontrovertible,—thus he is guilty of deceit, not exactly by forging facts, but by misstating their causes and their consequences.

We have read the edicts of Charlemagne, and must say, that we cannot discover one which obliges the pagan Saxons to a seeming or a real compliance with the Christian doctrine; and we are under the impression that such edicts, rigorous or otherwise, cannot be in existence, because we do find others in existence with which they would be incompatible. The fact is, many other critics whose sagacity was equal to Hume's whose information was at least equally accurate, and who, though they differed in religion as much from Charlemagne as did Mr. Hume, had much less virulent bigotry than he had. Reader

do not start, for Hume was a virulent bigot. Bigotry is not confined to one side of a question. Those men give the true cause for the severity, perhaps cruelty of the monarch; "he could place no dependence upon their promises, nor their oaths; and the moment his forces were withdrawn, after the conclusion of a treaty to observe which they had sworn, they were again in arms." How would General Jackson treat such persons? The cases are parallel. Is Jackson a bigot?

Those Saxons retired into Jutland, and the isles at the mouth of the Baltic, and, to use the words of Hume, "meeting there with a people of similar manners, they were readily received amongst them; and they soon stimulated the natives to concur in enterprises which both promised revenge upon the haughty conqueror,"—who informed Hume that Charlemagne was haughty?—"and afforded subsistence to those numerous inhabitants with which the northern countries were now overburdened."

This was the origin of the Danish invasions. Their first descent upon England was in the year 787. In 794, they made another incursion upon Northumberland. Poor, innocent, harmless beings! Would it not be the excess of bigotry to punish them because they were pagans, particularly as the executioners of vengeance must necessarily be Roman Catholics? In 832, they began more formidable and systematic invasions; and, by Mr. Hume's reasoning, to oppose their burning the country, their rapine, their abuse of women, their enslaving or massacre of men, particularly of nuns or monks, would be unpardonable bigotry. Yet Hume calls them *pirates*.

It was no easy matter to convert this people; yet, with God's assistance, their conversion was effected—not by rigorous edicts, but by mild and apostolic preaching.

In the year 822, St. Adelard, Abbot of Old Corbie, and cousin-german of Charlemagne, founded the abbey of New Corbie, otherwise, Corwey, upon the Weser, about nine miles from the city of Paderborn, and established very regular discipline therein. Amongst the monks who came hither from Old Corbie in France, was one named Anscharius, called by the Germans Sharies, and by the French Ansgar. He was sent with a number of missionaries into Jutland and other parts of Scandinavia, and their preaching was eminently successful. They were favoured by Harold, a prince of Denmark, who had been baptized in the court of Louis Debonnaire. In 832, Anscharius was made Archbishop of Hamburg, and Legate Apostolic, by Pope Gregory IV. In 845, the Normans and Danes, in an irruption, burned the city of Hamburg, and in 849, the see of Bremen becoming vacant, the Pope united that of Hamburg thereto, and made St. Anscharius, archbishop of the

union. The more northern regions having relapsed into idolatry, the saint made new efforts for their conversion, which were more permanently successful. He was greatly aided by the exertions of Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims. The first bishop of Bremen was St. Wilchad, an Englishman, a native of Northumberland, who was the first Christian missionary that passed the Elbe. He died in 789 or 790.

St. Rembert, a native of Flanders, in the vicinity of Bruges, succeeded St. Anscharius in the see of Bremen, in the year 865; he made great progress in spreading the faith in Denmark, and likewise began the conversion of the Sclavi or Vandals, and of the Brandenburghers. He died on the 11th of June, 888.

King Eric I. was baptized in 826. One of his successors, Swein, or Sweno II., apostatized, but his successor Knut, or Canute II., surnamed the Great, who succeeded Edmond Ironside also in the throne of England in 1017, became a Catholic. In his reign many of his followers embraced Christianity in England, and many of the English ecclesiastics laboured upon the Danish mission. Amongst these latter was St. William, who had been chaplain to Canute, and was afterwards bishop of Roschild, in the isle of Zealand. Upon the death of Canute, he was succeeded in his Danish dominions by his son Swein, whom the bishop had more than once to reprove for his choler and injustice, but who, entering into himself, was subsequently not only religious, but greatly useful in the propagation of the faith. St. William and he both died and were buried in Roschild, in the year 1067.

About two centuries later, St. Hyacinth, a member of the illustrious house of the counts of Oldrovens, one of the most noble in Silesia, son of Count Konski, and born in the castle of Saxony, in 1185, and who was also one of the first members of the Dominican order, having received the habit from St. Dominic himself in Rome, in the month of March, 1218, was a zealous apostle of this nation. The faith flourished therein, from its first planting and increase, as has been mentioned, until the anarchy and divisions of the sixteenth century.

In the year 1518, Christiern II. was King of Denmark; he was a tyrannical, ambitious, unprincipled monarch, and particularly aimed at getting possession of the crown of Sweden. Stenon, the Swedish king, suspected the archbishop of Upsal and other prelates of his dominions of being favourable to the views of Christiern, who in the next year invaded Sweden and got possession of the throne. His cruelties were excessive. This man added hypocrisy and sacrilege to his murders and usurpations. Driven from Stockholm, the Danish king no longer concealed his sentiments, but made open profession of his attachment to the

Lutheran cause: he was rejected by Denmark, his uncle Frederic, the Duke of Holstein, having been raised to the throne. Christiern took refuge in Holland, whence he returned with an army to regain the throne, in 1531; but being defeated and taken, he was cast into prison, where he died in the year 1559. Stenon having died in 1520, of a wound received in battle, Gustavus, the son of Eric Vasa, was chosen king of Sweden.

In Denmark, the new monarch, Frederic, introduced Lutheranism, and proscribed and persecuted the Catholics. He died in 1535, and was succeeded by his son, Christiern III., a good and moderate king, with the exception of his following the example of his father in the attempts of eradicating the Catholic religion by violence. Having founded a college at Copenhagen, and greatly encouraged learning, he died in 1559, and was succeeded by Frederic II. Very few of the inhabitants preserved their faith, and the number of clergymen were almost brought to nothing; the stragglers who lay hid in the country could seldom be discovered.

Somewhat more than a century later, an eminent Danish gentleman named Nicholas Stenon, who was born in Copenhagen, in the year 1638, was famous in Italy for his knowledge, particularly in medicine and anatomy. He resided at the court of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, in the year 1670. His parents had been Lutherans, and he was himself educated in that sect, and imbibed the strongest prejudices against Catholics; but finding by his intercourse with them, and his closer reading and accurate observation, that his notions of their belief and practice were altogether erroneous, his prejudices yielded to his judgment, and he some time afterwards became a Roman Catholic. Christian V., successor of Frederic III., was then king of Denmark, and being zealous for the improvement of the college of Copenhagen, he insisted upon the return thither of Mr. Stenon, to fill the chair of anatomy, promising that he should be undisturbed on the score of religion. Mr. Stenon went thither, but soon found that public prejudice was more powerful than the protection of a monarch. He returned into Italy, and, in the year 1677, he was consecrated bishop of Titiopolis, *in partibus*, and appointed by Innocent XI. Vicar Apostolic of the northwest of Europe. His principal residence was at Hamburg. He died at Schwerin in Mecklenburgh, on the 24th of November, 1686, after having effected much good. He paid as much attention as his means would admit, or their wants required, to the few Catholics that were still found in his native country, and it is only in the same way they have been as yet looked after, though

their numbers are now greatly increased and the profession of their religion is in a great degree sanctioned.

The total population of Denmark is stated at present at 1,565,000, of whom the Catholics are upwards of 60,000, perhaps 65,000.[77] But as the religion is now and has been of late, making considerable progress, the number at present is much greater than formerly.

[77] The figures given here and in following articles are amazingly at fault. Bishop England states that, at the time of his writing, the Catholics of Denmark numbered upwards of 60,000, perhaps 65,000. *Missiones Catholicae,* the official year-book of the Propaganda, gives, for 1901, the Catholic population of Denmark as 9,000. Is it possible that, in the space of about 70 years, the Catholic Church in Denmark lost more than 50,000 members? The presence of error is at once apparent. From Weimar's *Almanac* of 1835, about the time of Bishop England's writing, we learn that Denmark's Catholic population was 2,000. This figure stands consistently along with the 9,000 given by the Propaganda. The present population of Denmark is about 2,400,000. In the following articles on Norway and Sweden, Bishop England places the Catholic population of Norway at 30,000 and that of Sweden at 80,000. Weimar (1835) reduces the 110,000 to 4,000. In 1901, the *Missiones Catholicae* gives 3,400 as the entire Catholic population of Norway and Sweden combined. The present total population of Norway is about 2,150,000—of Sweden about 4,605,000. Bishop England estimates the Catholic population of Russia at 9,000,000. Weimar's *Almanac,* 1835, gives 2,400,000 less. According to the *Kirchenlexicon,* of 1894, the Catholics of Russia, 13 years ago, numbered 8,500,000. In 1835, European Turkey had a Catholic population of 310,000. The *Kirchenlexicon* for 1898 gives 548,850.—ED.

SWEDEN

[The Statistics given in the following sketches do not apply to present conditions]

This large tract of country was but little known, and we believe thinly inhabited, at the commencement of the Christian era. All to the north of Germany was, we may say, undiscovered, certainly unexplored, —and it was not until the arms of Charlemagne had struck terror into the northern barbarians, that it was safe to go amongst them.

In our account of Denmark, we stated the elevation of St. Anscharius to the See of Bremen, and to legatine authority. About the year 830, the King of Sweden sent to Louis Debonnaire for missionaries to preach Christianity amongst his subjects. St. Anscharius, then a monk at New Corbie, and Vitmar, another of the same house, were selected for that purpose, and had books and ornaments to present from the emperor to the king. Anscharius had been previously in Denmark, where he had planted the faith. On their voyage, they were plundered by pirates, and arrived quite destitute at Biorc, then the capital of Sweden, and the principal harbour and royal residence. Upsal was, at that time, a considerable city; but its site was much nearer to where Stockholm now is, than to where the present city of Upsal is built. Biorc is described as being situated upon an island two days' sail from Upsal; and we suppose it must be that island which is now called Waxholm, at the mouth of Lake Melar. Being received kindly by the king, they preached with great success, and found a considerable number of Christian slaves, who were delighted at the opportunity of receiving the sacraments, of which they had long been deprived. Herigar, governor of the capital, an intimate friend of the monarch, was converted at an early period, and greatly aided their exertions.

Anscharius, when raised to the See of Bremen, about the year 850, sent missionaries to revive the spirit which had, during some years, slumbered in Sweden; and then, by his own presence, roused it to energy and activity. The good work was continued by his successor, St. Rembert.

Again, in or about the year 925, Hunni, Archbishop of Bremen, arriving at Birca, which we suppose to be the same as Biorc, found but

one priest remaining in Sweden; and during the short and bloody reigns of the monarchs in the preceding sixty years, religion had been nearly forgotten; he died during his apostolic labours in that country, and was succeeded in the archbishopric of Bremen by St. Adaldagus, who filled that see during fifty-four years, and greatly promoted the conversion of the Swedes, and established some sees amongst them. Odincar, the elder, a religious Dane, and his nephew, of the same name, Bishop of Ripa, in Jutland, and one of the royal race of Denmark, who was consecrated by Libentius, Archbishop of Bremen, about the year 1000, laboured much also in the conversion of Sweden.

Nearly sixty years before the arrival of Bishop Odincar, King Olas Scobcong had requested the British King Edred to procure some missionaries for Sweden. Sigefride, an eminent priest of York, in England, undertook the task; and on the 21st of June, 950, he arrived at Wexio, in the territory of Smaland, in Gothland. Twelve of the principal inhabitants of this district were his first converts. St. Sigefride had received episcopal consecration before his arrival in Sweden, and ample missionary powers, by virtue of which he was enabled to erect new sees, and to fill them. He erected the sees of Lingkopping in West Gothland, and Skara in East Gothland. He then appointed his nephew Uduman, to take charge of his see of Wexio, and went farther north; he baptized King Olas, and his household, and his army, established the see of Strengues, and restored that of Upsal, which had been founded by St. Anscharius. During his absence from Wexio, the idolaters plundered the church, and murdered Uduman and his two brothers, Sunaman a deacon, and Wiamar a sub-deacon. St. Sigefride having returned to Wexio, prevailed on the king to spare the lives of the murderers, and refused to accept a fine which was levied upon them; and having re-established his church, he died, and was buried in his cathedral in the year 1002.

The faith was propagated in another part of Sweden, soon after, by St. Eskill, an Englishman, who was consecrated Bishop of Nordhans Kogh, and martyred by the pagans at Strengis. Adelbert, Archbishop of Bremen, and Sweyn II., King of Denmark, did much in this century to extend the reign of truth in Sweden.

In the year 1148, St. Henry, an Englishman, who had laboured strenuously on the Swedish and other northern missions, together with his countryman, Cardinal Nicholas Breakspear, apostolic legate, and afterwards Pope Adrian IV., did much to confirm and to establish the faith.

Upsal was raised to the dignity of an archbishopric during the in-

cumbency of Stephen, its sixth bishop and first archbishop; and in 1160, Pope Alexander III. created the archbishop of that see metropolitan and primate of the Swedish church. We may, at this period, consider Sweden as fully converted.

In the year 1517, the persons commissioned by the Pope to preach up indulgences for the contribution towards building the Church of St. Peter's in Rome, were guilty of great excesses and extortions in Sweden. Angus Arcemboldi, legate of the north, was the chief commissioner there, and had the sanction of Stenon, administrator, claiming to be King of Sweden. In an interview with that ruler, the legate attempted to reconcile him to Gustavus Troil, Archbishop of Upsal; but Stenon gave him sufficient reasons to justify his distrust in Gustavus, and showed the probability of this prelate's holding an improper correspondence with Christiern II. of Denmark, well known by the appellation of the Nero of the North, and who wished to confirm his authority in Sweden. The Danish King having manifested his hostility, Stenon had the Primate of Upsal tried by the senate, and being convicted, he was deprived of his revenues, and confined in a monastery. The prelate had privately made an appeal to Rome, in which he stated his case to be one of great hardship. Arcemboldi was instructed to demand his release and restitution. Stenon and the senate refused; upon which Leo X. placed Sweden under an interdict, and excommunicated Stenon and the senate. The Archbishop of Lunden, in Holstein, and the Bishop of Odensea, were charged with the execution; and Christiern of Denmark, who hypocritically appeared to be still a Catholic, though in truth a Lutheran, was requested to aid them. Stenon now seized upon the money which had been collected for Arcemboldi, and a new excommunication followed; and Christiern, who longed for the opportunity, entered Sweden at the head of his army. Stenon died fighting at the head of his troops. Christiern got possession of the capital. The archbishop was released and reinstated in his revenues. The bloody Christiern treacherously siezed upon and put to death in one day, at an entertainment where all appeared to be peace and amity, the principal lords of Sweden. He then, at the instigation of the Primate of Upsal, required the two prelate commissioners to investigate the proceedings under which the primate had been originally punished; but, as their proceedings were too slow, he, of his own authority, condemned and executed ninety-six senators who survived, and amongst whom were the Bishops of Strenignen and Skara. The Prior of St. John of Jerusalem, who had manifested most patriotism, was fastened to a St. Andrew's Cross, and embowelled, and his heart torn

out; the bodies were then ranged in a line, and all the heads raised on spears,—after which, the soldiers were let loose upon the populace; next day, an amnesty was published, but violated as soon as the people made their appearance. Christiern then invited to a conference six bishops who had refused to assist at his Swedish coronation; and they, imagining that peace was at length to be given, met him,—they were seized upon and burned. This caused so general an insurrection, that the tyrant fled. Having left Sweden, he made open profession of Lutheranism.

Olaus Petri had already introduced the novel doctrines amongst the Swedes. Gustavus, the son of Eric Vasa, Duke of Gripsholm, had, after a variety of difficulties and extraordinary escapes, found, amongst the hardy miners of Delecarlia, a patriotic spirit; he began the liberation of his country with this little band; his standard soon floated victorious, and overshadowed multiplied thousands. Gustavus Ericson, or Vasa, was chosen king; he wanted money, Olaus informed him, that, according to the Lutheran principles, it was unlawful to take away what was possessed by the monasteries, and to reduce the income of the parish churches. Gustavus, who had, during his captivity in Denmark, been predisposed to this new system, began to pave the way for carrying it into execution,—but met considerable opposition from the few bishops that still remained in Sweden; thenceforward, Gustavus encouraged the Lutheran preachers.

Pope Adrian VI. sent, as his legate to Gustavus, John Magni, an eminent and highly informed Swedish ecclesiastic; the king received him kindly, and prevailed upon him to accept the primacy which was now vacant, by the degradation and banishment of the late unprincipled incumbent. The new primate soon perceived the true object at which the king aimed, for it had been proposed to him to convoke a synod, and to establish the Lutheran doctrine. The primate was not a man to betray his charge, but he saw he could not avert the storm; he, therefore returned to Rome.

In the year 1527, the king assembled the senate at Upsal, and subsequently at Arosen; at which meeting he declared, that, unless they abolished the religion and the supremacy of the Roman See, he would abdicate: and that the revenues of the state demanded the confiscation of the church-lands and property. Though a considerable portion of the legislature was composed of Roman Catholics, they were awed into acquiescence to his demands. He still left what he called liberty of conscience. The spirit of Dalecarlia was still unbroken; and this brave people, being all Roman Catholics, they took up arms to oppose

the invasion of their rights of conscience, and the plunder of the property consecrated to the support of their pastors, by him whom they had borne on their shoulders to victory, and to a throne. Gustavus, after having subdued them, treated the Dalecarlians in the most severe and cruel manner, because they did not choose to change their religion.

In 1542, the king procured from the General Assembly the nomination of his son Eric as his successor, and the regulation that the crown should be hereditary; he also caused them to swear to the maintenance of Lutheranism, without tolerating any other religion. He had previously ran through the provinces at the head of a large body of cavalry, extirpating Catholicity.

The Lutheranism which he established, has, in its external appearance and discipline, more affinity to the Catholic religion than any other sort of the new system. There are archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons; their liturgy very much resembles that of Rome, and they have confession and absolution, and penance, but the confession is not always private.

Eric XIV, succeeded, upon the death of his father, Gustavus, in 1560, but his conduct was that of a madman; he was deposed in 1568, for a variety of cruelties, and his attempt at raising Catherine, one of his concubines, who had been a fruit-girl in Stockholm, to the dignity of queen.

His brother, John III., was chosen to succeed him. He was married to Catherine, of the Jaggelon family, daughter to Sigismund, King of Poland. This queen was a Roman Catholic, and her husband having made a profession of that faith, in presence of Father Possevin, a Jesuit, was desirous of having his dominions reconciled to the Holy See. For this purpose, he sent Pontus de la Gardie to Rome, with proposals of reunion; but the Swedish nobility gave their decided opposition to the measure, though many of the clergy had manifested their anxiety to co-operate with the king. Though the project was unsuccessful, a number of priests gained admittance into Sweden, and were able to console and to administer to the scattered members of the church who were in the country. The queen died, leaving only one son, Sigismund, who adhered to the religion of his parents, and obtained the crown of Poland; though he lost that of Sweden, on account of his religion, through the intrigues of his uncle, Charles IV., son of Gustavus, who procured the deposition of Sigismund, and his own appointment, under the title of Charles IX. He is mentioned in high terms of commendation, by some of the early Protestant writers, for having, through religious zeal, supplanted his nephew and usurped his throne.

Christina succeeded her father, the renowned Gustavus Adolphus, the head of the Protestant League, upon his death in 1654, and the twenty-eighth of her age. This extraordinary woman resigned her throne, and abjured the religion she had previously professed, embracing the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Hitherto, the renowned and learned daughter of the great Gustavus had been the object of admiration and of eulogy, the pride of the North; but now, the most scrutinizing criticism pried into all her conduct, and doubts as to whether she were really a great woman began to be entertained; and it was stated, ay, seriously stated, that it was not because she believed in the truth of those doctrines, to profess which she renounced a throne, that she changed her religion, but because "the austere manners and narrow acquisitions of the Swedish clergy were not likely to have attached her to their opinions; and they certainly were little able to vie in her estimation with the splendid and courtly dignitaries of the Romish Church." But, the historiographer, from whom we have made the quotation, has, in his zeal against the Romish religion, overlooked the fact that the Queen of Sweden, at the time if her conversion, had not an opportunity of seeing or conversing with those splendid and courtly dignitaries whom she subsequently met in the polished and literary circles of the South: for in Sweden there were then but a few obscure and indigent Catholic clergymen, who had renounced the pomp of the world, and exposed themselves to affliction, that they might comfort a persecuted flock. It is true, the attainments of the Swedish Lutheran clergy were never great.

Christina travelled into France, Italy, and Germany, spending much of her time in Rome. Upon the death of Charles Gustavus X., the cousin of Christina, to whom she had resigned the throne, her finances being embarrassed, she in 1660 went into Sweden to obtain payments, but was very badly received by her former subjects; they refuseed her incomes, pulled down her chapel, and some Italian clergymen who accompanied her were insulted, and exposed to eminent danger. The states required a repetition of her act of renunciation, before they would suffer her to receive her revenue: and she then bade a final adieu to her country, and died in Rome in 1689.

Charles XI., who succeeded his father, Charles X., was one of the most stern, arbitrary, and despotic monarchs. He published an edict, forbidding the exercise of any religion but that of Luther, in Sweden, about the year 1690. This caused great dissatisfaction, for at that period numbers of other sectaries were in several parts of his kingdom,

who disliked the Lutheran mode nearly as much as they did the Catholic religion.

The events of the last century, in this country, have nothing to do with the religious view which it is our object to give. In the year 1810, the then reigning monarch was forced to a resignation, and Bernadotte, who rose from the lowest ranks of the army to be a general officer and marshal in the revolutionary service of France, upon obtaining the throne, changed his name and his religion. He was crowned by the name of Charles John, and having abjured the Roman Catholic faith, he professed Lutheranism.

The present Swedish dominions contain nearly three millions of inhabitants, of which the principal portion are Lutherans. From the documents we have seen, we believe they may be estimated as follows:

Lutherans	2,250,000
Other Protestants, ...	450,000
Roman Catholics, ...	80,000
	2,780,000
Add to these the inhabitants of Lapland, who are mostly pagans, estimated at	60,000
Total population, ...	2,840,000

NORWAY

Norway was part of Scandinavia. About seventy years before the Christian era, Odin or Wodan, a Scythian chieftain from the borders of the Palus Mœtis, came into Scandinavia and subdued the aborigines. His wife was Frigga or Freia, and the most valiant of his sons was Thor. Subsequently they were considered as the three principal deities of the North; and as the Orkneys, the Shetland, and Faroe Islands, together with Iceland and part of Scotland, came under their dominion, their mythology diffused itself through these regions. The Danes, who had possession of England, had, before their conversion to Christianity, the same doctrines and dieties as the Norwegians. The Romans had introduced their mythology too into Britain, and the Saxons had a blending of the observances of the North and South, previously to their conversion.

The days of the week derived their appellations from the dieties. Sunday was sacred to Apollo or the sun, Monday to Diana or the moon, Tuesday to Mars, amongst the Romans, but the Northerns took the liberty of changing the name to suit the appellation of that of their own favourite, Tsycne, one of the sons of Wodan; Mercury was dispossessed of his day, in order to leave room for Odin or Wodan, who thus got Wednesday; Jove was obliged to give up his day to the superior claims of Thor; and as the next day was sacred to Venus, this Grecian lady was forced to yield to the superior claims of Freia, the beauty of the North; and Saturn was permitted to retain quiet possession of his own day.

We have been led to this little digression from noticing the state of Norwegian mythology in the early days of Christianity. From what has appeared in our last numbers, our readers must see that the faith was considerably spread in the kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden, in the ninth century. Persecution in one place has usually been the cause of its establishment in other places, especially in the first ages. Such was the case in Scandinavia.

About the year 915, Gourm, King of Denmark was violent and inexorable in the persecution of the Christians in his dominions; his object was to extirpate the professors of the religion of our Lord. There were many martyrs, but many also fled, and carried with them the doctrines

of salvation. Some of the fugitives going into Norway, first brought the light of faith into those darkened regions, and warmed the hearts of a benumbed people into gratitude to heaven.

The missionaries sent by St. Adaldagus in this age, also aided in the great work, in that part of Norway which borders upon Sweden, where they were more occupied.

Harold, King of Denmark, procured many missionaries for the North, a few of whom penetrated into Norway. After this martyrdom, his sovereign, who had raised the infidels in rebellion, was subdued by Eric in Sweden: and one of the consequences of an application to Eric by Poppo, the Bishop of Sleswick, was the facility and encouragement afforded for following up the northern missions.

The state of Norway had been hitherto unsettled; but about the year 1020, the independence and integrity of the kingdom were established. Olaus or Olave, son of Herald Granscius, Prince of Westfold, in Norway, by his wife Asta, daughter of Gulbrand Kuta, the Governor of Gulbrand's Dale or Valley, sailed for England in the year 1013. Norway was then, and had been for some time, annoyed and partitioned by Sweno, King of Denmark, Olave Scot Konung, son of Eric, King of Sweden, and Eric, son of Hacon, Earl of Norway. At the time of leaving his country Olave was a Christian, and formed the design of having Norway freed from the oppression of foreigners, and the darkness of paganism. He assisted King Ethelred against the Danes, after the death of Sweno, and thus emancipated his countrymen from their oppression. He next waged war against Olaus Scot Konung, who had succeed his father upon the throne of Sweden; and having obtained exemption of the Norwegian territory from the future aggressions and incursions of Sweden, he married the daughter of the Swedish monarch, who was also a Christian, and by a domestic regulation with the earl, he became monarch of Norway.

Previous to his leaving England he procured a number of zealous missionaries, whom he brought with him—one of them, Grimkele, was consecrated Bishop of Drontheim. The laws of Norway were revised and amended, and civilization began to spread itself, together with Christianity, and both were also communicated to Iceland and the islands.

Olave is honoured as a saint in the Roman Catholic Church; his acts were those of a wise potentate, and a man of pure religion. He used his utmost exertions to extirpate idolatry, but this so exasperated the adherents to paganism that they took up arms, and, being assisted by Canute of Denmark, they overcame him. Olaus took refuge with his

father-in-law, who aided him with troops to recover his throne, but he was slain at Stickstadt, north of Drontheim, on the 29th of July, 1028.

After some commotions, Hackin, whom Canute made Viceroy of Norway, being drowned, and Sweno, the son of Canute, and viceroy after his cousin Hackin, having fled from Norway, Harold, the brother of St. Olaus, persecuted the Christians, and encouraged the pagans. Many suffered martyrdom under him; Adalbert, Archbishop of Bremen, finally prevailed on him to desist. But in 1035, Magnus, the son of Olave, being of age, was called out of Russia, where he had taken refuge, and placed upon the Norwegian throne; he rebuilt the Cathedral of Drontheim in such style of magnificence, as to be considered the pride of the North; it was dedicated under the invocation of his father, whose shrine was richly ornamented. This prince did much for the propagation of the faith.

Nicholas Breakspear, who was afterwards Pope Adrian IV., was, together with some others of his countrymen, employed upon the northern missions, particularly in Norway, of which he is often called the apostle, about the year 1140. Pope Eugenius III., in approbation of his zeal and success, created him Cardinal and Bishop of Alba; and in the next century St. Hyacinth, one of the first Dominican friars, preached in that country with great fruit, about a century after it had been the theatre of Cardinal Breakspear's exertions.

We are not aware of any particular facts that accompanied the change of religion in Norway, in the sixteenth century, which would require special notice in such a summary as we give. Placed between Sweden, Denmark, and Scotland, where what was called Reformation was carried on in a style of masterly severity, persecuting all who would not conform to the new tenets, and sometimes bowed under the yoke of Denmark, sometimes under that of Sweden, the Church of Norway was destroyed towards the middle of that century, and Lutheranism was upheld and protected. Some Catholics still were to be found in Norway, and some other descriptions of Protestants, but Lutheranism was, and is, the dominant sect.

ESTIMATE.

Lutherans,	700,000
Other Protestants,	200,000
Roman Catholics,	30,000
Pagans,	30,000
	960,000

Iceland was converted to the Catholic faith, principally in the

thirteenth century, and the professors of that faith were persecuted into a conformity with the Norwegian and Danish changes, and left without Roman Catholic clergymen, in the commencement of the seventeenth century.

The Faroe Islands were converted earlier to the faith, and retained it longer than Iceland; we scarcely know how to characterize the religion of either at present. In both portions the number of Catholics is inconsiderable, not exceeding 5,000; the other sects calling themselves Christians, about 20,000; and pagans, upwards of 20,000. Very little exertion is at present made to communicate instruction to those people.

RUSSIA

SECTION I

This vast country contains the principal portion of the ancient Sarmatia, Scythia, and part of what was Scandinavia. The Tartars and Muscovites, in latter times, were the principal occupants of these extensive territories; and, in the intermediate period, after the emigrations of the Goths and Vandals, the Sclavi, the Russi, the Hunni, the Turci, and various other tribes, extended themselves more or less through these undefined regions. Russia extends through Europe and Asia, and comprises a portion of America. To enter, specially upon the sketch of each part, and combining their outlines to give a view of the entire, is what we shall probably do at a future period. We shall in this number confine ourselves to a very brief and general statement of the establishment of Christianity and its decay in European Russia.

In the seventh and eighth centuries, some knowledge of the Christian religion was obtained by the barbarous tribes above mentioned, from slaves whom they had taken from the civilized nations in some of their incursions, and from fugitives and adventurers from those nations. But very little progress was thus made; some persons, brought to a knowledge of the great mysteries of redemption, were baptized, principally by laymen.

In the beginning of the ninth century, Michael the Stammerer, and his successor, Theophilus, iconoclasts and emperors of the East, persecuted the Catholics, especially the holy Patriarchs of Constantinople, Saints Nicephorus and Methodius. Theodora, the widow of Theophilus, administered during the minority of her son Michael III., whom she educated in the Roman Catholic faith. About the year 848, the Chazari, who were a tribe of Turci that had migrated from the banks of the Volga, the ancient Dra, sent a solemn embassy to the regent and her son, with a request to have some Christian missionaries procured for them. They were at that time governed by Chagans, or Chams, who had regal authority, and were but one of seven or eight tribes similarly circumstanced.

Theodora applied to St. Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who

sent a number of clergymen under Cyril, a very learned priest, who was surnamed the Philosopher. Cyril's original name was Constantine; he was a native of Thessalonica, noted for his zeal and piety equally as for his learning. Having instructed the nation, baptized the Cham, and organized churches, he returned to Constantinople.

Accompanied by his brother St. Methodius, St. Cyril afterwards preached the faith in several parts of what is now Turkey, and in part of the present Austrian dominions; but from his first mission [under] the authority of St. Ignatius, who held communion with and acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope, the southern part of what is now Russia, received the faith.

From Bulgaria, where the two brothers spread the light of the Gospel, it penetrated into the southwestern parts of the same empire, then held by the Sclavi, who had gone southwards.

In the year 892, Rurick, Sineus, and Tyuwor, three brothers, came by invitation from the Warengi, on the borders of the Baltic, and governed the Russi and Sclavonians in their vicinity. Rurick being the survivor, was sole monarch. He fixed his residence near Lake Lagoda. His son Igor transferred his seat of government to Kiow. Ogla, his wife, surviving him, and going to Constantinople, was instructed in the faith, and was there baptized: though her son Suastoslas died an idolater, yet her grandson Wladimir the Great, embraced Christianity and was baptized; he married Anne, a Grecian princess, and built the city Wladimira; by his means the truths of the Gospel were made known in another portion of what is now the Russian empire.

The manner in which Olga, who is also called Helena, conducted herself in very delicate circumstances is worthy of notice. Her husband Ihor, or Igor, undertook an expedition against Constantinople, and having been repulsed by the generals of the Emperors, Romanus and Constantine, was slain by the Dreulans upon his retreat: Olga, his widow, then a pagan, revenged his death, subdued the Dreulans, and governed her husband's dominions with great prudence. About the year 945, she being then in peace, went to Constantinople; was instructed and baptized by the name of Helena, leaving the government to her son Suastoslas. After her conversion she returned home, and died in the year 970. Her son never embraced Christianity, but his son Wladimir, or, according to others, spelled Volodimir, became a Christian, and obtained in marriage Anne, the sister of the two associated brothers [the] Emperors Basil and Constantine. Nicholas Chrysoberga, the Roman Catholic Patriarch of Constantinople, sent, in 987, a number of clergy under the authority of Michael, whom he appointed their superior, into

this country, in which they established the faith and extended considerably the influence of the Gospel. The title of Volodimir was Duke of the Russi. In the year 1156 George, Duke of Russia, built Moscow; and it was only in the year 1552 that Iwan, or John II., took the title of Czar, or King of Muscovy.

That part of Poland which belongs to this empire owes its conversion principally to the zealous labours of St. Adalbert, or Albert, in the first instance.

Adalbert was born in Bohemia in the year 956, and was in baptism called Woytiach, which, in Sclavonian, signifies "Help of the Army." Being placed by his parents under the care of Adalbert, Archbishop of Magdeburg, the greatest care was taken of his education, and the archbishop in confirmation gave him his own name. He was promoted to holy orders in 983 by Diethmar, Bishop of Prague, and in that same year was appointed successor to this same prelate, who died soon after his ordination. He was consecrated by the Archbishop of Mentz. Finding but little fruit from his preaching in Prague, he went to Rome and had his resignation accepted by Pope John XV. in 989, and retired into a monastery; but in 994 the same Pope, at the solicitations of the Archbishop of Mentz, compelled him to resume his see; but with a proviso, that if his exertions there should be fruitless, he might retire whither he would. Profiting of this clause, upon discovering the perfect inutility of his attempts to bring to practical religion, a people who merely listened to and admired him, and were content with the bare and barren profession of the faith, he went to preach to the infidels of Poland and Hungary, and was on terms of friendship with Stephen, king of the latter place, whom he had specially instructed.

Being again ordered by Pope Gregory V. to return to Prague, he was refused admittance by Boleslas, Prince of Bohemia, and a number of his adherents, upon which he retired into Poland, where Miceslas was then duke, and whose son and principal counsellor Boleslas, was a particular friend of Adalbert. This Boleslas, succeeding in his wishes of having the people instructed, saw a vast accession to the Christian church, by the labours of the holy bishop, who was martyred by a body of Prussian infidels, on the 23d of April, 997. Duke Miceslas sent ambassadors to Rome, but he died before their return in 999; he was succeeded by his son Boleslas I., surnamed Chabri or the Great, who became the first King of Poland.

Miceslas, his father, having in 965 embraced the faith upon his marriage with the Christian princess, daughter of Boleslas, Duke of Bohemia, and sister to him who opposed the return of St. Adalbert to

Prague, caused the introduction of the Gospel into his dominions, which was fully established under the auspices of the son.

Still further north was a people called Russi or Rutheni, who were some of the most northern European Scythians; they derived their pedigree from the ancient Roxolani mentioned by Strabo and Pliny, as beyond the Boristhynes, near the Gatæ. The word Rosscia in their language, signifies scattering: and they were supposed to be denominated from living not in towns or cities, but scattered over the country. Nations, similarly scattered, were by the Greeks called Spori, or scattered.

About the latter end of the tenth century, a young Saxon nobleman, named Boniface or Bruno, leaving the court of the Emperor Otho III., joined the order of Camaldoli under St. Romuald, and after a long preparation by prayer and retirement and meditation, presented himself to Pope John XVIII., to preach to the infidels; having received the necessary faculties, he was consecrated archbishop of his mission by Taymont, archbishop of Magdeburg, and passing through Prussia, he entered the territory of the Russi, where he made several converts, having endured much persecution and affliction; he baptized one of the kings of that place, and several of his people; soon after which, he was seized upon by the infidels and beheaded, together with eighteen of his companions, in the year 1009; but the faith continued to made considerable progress after his death.

Finland was principally converted by St. Henry, Archbishop of Upsal, in 1151.

In the next century, St. Hyacinth, of the order of St. Dominic, a noble Silesian, of whom we made mention in a former number, extended the faith greatly in Poland, and subsequently passing into Lesser Russia, Muscovy, and the neighbouring nations, he preached with great fruit until the destruction of Kiow by the Tartars, in 1231, when he returned into Poland, where he remained for some time, and then proceeded to join some other members of his order, who were sent into Tartary; and thousands having embraced the faith, one of their princes, together with several lords of his nation, attended at the Council of Lateran in 1245. Having penetrated through Tartary nearly to Thibet and the East Indies, he founded in several places Christian churches. Thence coming back to Poland, he again entered Red Russia, where he made many additional converts, and returning to Cracow, died in 1257.

In the year 846, upon the death of St. Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople, St. Ignatius was raised to that dignity. The Emperor Michael III. was led on, by his favourite uncle Bardas, to the most shame-

ful excesses of profligacy. The holy patriarch remonstrated with him but in vain; Bardas was, for his criminal habits, driven from the sacraments and excommunicated; his rage led him to threaten to stab Ignatius, but he bethought himself of a less revolting mode of revenge. He persuaded the young monarch that his mother domineered over him and deprived him of his just power—recommended that Ignatius should be ordered to cut off her hair, and that of her three daughters, and have them placed in some monastery. The patriarch, of course refused to perform so irreligious an act of violence; upon which, by the instigation of Bardas, Michael had his minions to perform the acts of violence, and Ignatius was banished to a monastery in the isle of Terebinthus, where every effort was used to force him to a resignation, which he refused. Photius, a very learned, but very profligate relative of the emperor, was ordained bishop, from being a layman in office at the court, and on the sixth day intruded into the patriarchial chair, on Christmas day, 858. A synod of bishops met in Constantinople, and excommunicated Photius, who also proceeded against them, not merely with a similar form, but by force of arms, and the aid of Bardas. We do not here find it necessary to dwell upon facts which shall hereafter be particuliarized; suffice it to say, that after the unravelling of much deceit, Photius was excommunicated by Rome, which he had endeavoured to deceive; and in return, in the year 866, by the aid of the emperor, he held a sort of council at Constantinople, in which he excommunicated and pronounced sentence of deposition against Pope Nicholas, and thus commenced the Greek schism. Bardas was put to death in that year by the emperor, for conspiring against his life; and in September of the next year, the emperor himself was slain by his guard, for attempting to depose Basil, whom he had joined with him in the empire. Basil succeeded, and banished Photius; Ignatius was restored, and the schism healed, but its effects were not destroyed. Photius, upon the death of Ignatius, in 878, took possession of the church of St. Sophia with an armed force, and obtained from John VIII. the appointment to the patriarch at the request of Basil, upon conditions which Photius never fulfilled; the intruder was then condemned by John, and by his successors Martin or Marinus, Adrian III., and Stephen V. After the death of Basil, his son Leo the Wise, or the Philosopher, succeeded, who at the request of the Pope Stephen, banished Photius into a monastery in Armenia, where he died. The union was then perfect between the Popes and Patriarchs of Constantinople during upwards of a century; but the schism under Michael Cerularius, in 1053, made a very considerable portion of the East separate from the centre of unity.

The vicinity of Southern Russia to Constantinople, their union for so long a time with that metropolis, from which their forefathers had received faith, and the similarity of their discipline, would appear to cause the Muscovites easily to be led into the separation. The contiguity of Kiow, the then capital of the Russians, to the city caused more frequent communications between the Dukes of Russia and the emperors of the East, so that the court and the principal ecclesiastics, having joined in the schism, it would me more generally adhered to.

This, however, was not the case, for we find strong and impregnable evidence, of the Russian churches continuing Catholic during the centuries, notwithstanding the unfounded assertions of many sectaries and Catholics to the contrary. We have principally noticed that Wladimir, the son of Igor, was the duke who principally established the faith in Kiow and the rest of his dominions. His successor was Jaroslas, his son, who was succeeded in 1078 by Wsevolod I., his grandson, in whose reign Ephrem, Metropolitan of Kiow, executed the bull of Urban II. for the feast of the translation of the relics of St. Nicholas, of Bari, on the 9th of May. His son Andrew Bogoliski, transferred the ducal residence from Kiow to Wladimira. In 1156, George, Duke of Russia, recovered Kiow, and built Moscow, so called from a monastery called Moskoi, which previously stood there, and had its name from Mus or Muisk men, *i. e.* is the seat or residence of select men. Under George II., Duke of Muscovy, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, many of the Russians were involved in the schism, but in 1244, they were formally reunited to the Holy See. His son, Alexander, succeeded in 1246; he is honoured as a saint in the Russian Church, and lived and died in the faith and communion of the Roman Catholic Church; he is called St. Alexander Newski, or of Newa, from a great victory he obtained over the Poles and Teutonic Knights in Livonia, on the banks of the Newa, when he was Prince of Novogorod, in 1241; his death took place in 1262, at Gorodes. The Czar, Peter the Great, built a convent of Basilian monks to his honour near St. Petersburgh, and in 1725, Catherine instituted the second order of Russian knighthood under his name. In 1304, Daniel, fourth son of Alexander, left by his father Duke of Moscow, after the death of his three elder brothers, became ruler, and made Moscow the ducal residence. In 1415, during the reign of Basil or Vasili II., Photius, Metropolitan of Russia, residing at Kiow, joined the Greek schism, and being deposed on that account by a council held at Novogrodek, he retired into Great Russia, and there spread his poison. His successor in Kiow, Gregory, assisted at the Council of Constance. There were then, and had been for some

time in Russia, seven archbishops and a proportionate number of bishops.

The schism having made rapid progress, in the year 1588 the Archbishop of Moscow was, by Jeremy, the schismatical Patriarch of Constantinople, declared Patriarch of all Russia, and recognised as such by the schismatical Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, upon condition that he should be chosen by them. Most of the Muscovites, thenceforward, were engaged in the schism, and joined several heresies thereto. But the Archbishops of Kiow still continued Catholic, as did almost all Polish Russia, which, since the year 1600, has been under a Metropolitan of Kiow, Archbishop of Ploses, and Bishops of Presmilia, Liceoria, and Leopold; but in 1686, Kiow being ceded to the Muscovites, they established a schismatical metropolitan therein—Photius and Jonas II. being the only preceding prelates who were not Catholics.

The first czar was Iwan, or John IV., in 1552. In the reign of Czar Michael Alexis Witz, Nicon, a ambitious and crafty man, was the schismatical patriarch; he told the czar, that it was a useless and derogatory custom, for the Patriarch of Muscovy to seek for confirmation from Constantinople, or the other patriarchs; that he derived his power from the Holy Ghost, and ought not to seek it from man. The czar countenanced him, and he quickly increased the number of archbishops and bishops in the state. Having regulated church affairs to his liking, he next assumed a right to guide the decisions of the senate, and to direct the czar in making peace or war, lest he might act against conscience, and insisted, that he should decide upon the justice or injustice of the laws previous to their promulgation. The czar and the senate opposed his pretentions—he would not abate a particle—excommunicated several of the senate, and excited rebellion, in which much blood was shed. The czar finding the patriarch still unsubdued, assembled a council in 1667, paying the expenses of any bishop in or out of his dominions, who would attend; it consisted of three patriarchs, twenty-seven archbishops, one hundred and ten bishops, and one hundred and fifty other Russian ecclesiastics.

This synod deposed the patriarch, ordering that he should be confined, during the rest of his life in a convent, and fed on bread and water.

That the czar and senate should have votes in the election of the patriarch, who should be amenable to their judgment.

That the Patriarch of Constantinople should have no right to the appellation of head of the Russion Church, nor any authority therein, but such as the czar should think proper to bestow on him.

That no more property should be given or left to convents or

churches; and that the patriarch should have no authority to erect new diocesses or establishments without the consent of the czar and the senate.

SECTION II

In our last number, we gave a short account of the establishment of Christianity in this country, and the subsequent introduction of the Greek schism, and latter change of discipline and separation of the Muscovite church from the Greek, so that what is now the Russian Church, is no more a portion of the Greek, than it is of the Roman Catholic Church. In future publications, we shall exhibit the special differences by which the Greek Church, which still continues schismatical and heretical, is separated from the Roman Catholic Church; but, let not our readers imagine, that the whole Greek Church is out of the communion of the see of Rome; as we shall find in our future exhibitions, millions of the members of the Eastern church are Roman Catholics. But, to continue our remarks upon Russia.

In 1588, the great body of the Russian clergy and people joined in the Greek schism, and in 1667, they formed an independent establishment, of which, in fact, they made the czar and senate of the empire the head, and rejecting the authority of the patriarch of Constantinople, formally separated from him. The patriarchs of Moscow still had many quarrels with the court until the time of Peter the Great.

The descendants of Rurick, whom we have noticed in our last, as the founder of the race of dukes and czars, became extinct in Feoder or Theodore, in 1598. After some contention and confusion, Michael, of the family of Romanow, allied to the preceding czars, was chosen Great Duke of Muscovy, in 1613. His third descendant was Peter the Great, who founded the Russian empire. In the year 1700, the patriarchate became vacant, and after nineteen years, Peter, who had made some unsuccessful negotiations for a reunion with the see of Rome, declared himself head of the Russian Church, had an archbishop appointed for Moscow, and placed the church government under a sort of committee, consisting of ecclesiastics and laymen—in which state it still continues.

There is a considerable division in the Russian Church, a large body who call themselves Sterawersi, or old faithful, having separated from the principal sect. This division has existed for a long time, but the formal separation was made in the patriarchate of Nicon. They were persecuted by the dominant party until Peter the Great established a limited freedom of conscience, tolerating every religion, but forbid-

ding any persons to leave the Russian Church for the purpose of joining the Roman Catholic.

Lutheranism was introduced at an early period of the sixteenth century, particularly by the Swedes into Finland, which, until lately, belonged to them, and into the adjoining parts of Archangel and Novogorod. In 1559, William of Furstenberg, Herr Meister of Livonia, or Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights, who then governed Livonia, having become a Lutheran, resigned his office in favour of Gothhard Kettler, who had been his coadjutor master. This man having also embraced the new doctrines, ceded a part of Livonia to the Danes, and the principal portion of Poland, receiving the investiture of the dukedoms of Courland and Samagotia, as secular. The new doctrines spread from those places into Russia, so that Lutheranism made consederable progress in the northwestern part of that country. In the year 1581, Pope Gregory XIII. wrote to the czar, John Vasilievitz, who was a Roman Catholic, to request he would send the Lutheran preachers out of his dominions, but the czar wrote back a refusal, stating, that in his country, all nations should have the free exercise of their several religions.

Many Calvinists subsequently found their way thither from the more southern regions of Europe, particularly through Poland and Germany, and in the time of Peter the Great, from Holland, and latterly from Scotland.

The Armenians separated from the see of Rome, as well as those in its communion, are by no means a small number of the Christians of this country. The latter, of course, being members of the universal Catholic body, are to be ranked under their proper head. A very considerable portion of this body which was schismatic, and resided in Poland under a patriarch, has been reunited to the Catholic Church, together with its patriarch, in 1616.

After the conquest of Greece by the Turks, and the establishment of Mahommedanism in the east of Europe, many of the Mussulmen settled in Russia, and, at present, the number in the European part of that empire is by no means inconsiderable.

By these several means, the Roman Catholic religion has been greatly reduced in this large empire, but still, the numbers who have adhered to it, are by no means few.

In the middle of the last century, the Jesuits, who had been frequently the objects of gross misrepresentation and unfounded calumny, were established in many places, to diffuse the light of science in this country. They had previously laboured as missionaries, and been, to a certain degree, successful; but, when they were driven from the rest

of Europe, they, in the dominions of Catherine, found an asylum; the great obstacle to their labours was principally the law which forbid any person to become a convert; yet many, notwithstanding this law, embraced the doctrines of the church. In 1782, the number of Roman Catholics had greatly increased; and in the next year, at the request of the Empress Catherine II., Stanislaus Siestrzencewez, was consecrated in Rome first Archbishop of Mohilow, and primate of the Roman Catholic Church of Russia, on the feast of St. Thomas the apostle, December, 21. The patriarchate of Kiow had thus been superseded.

Upon the seizure of a considerable part of what once was Poland, by the Empress of Russia, in the last century, a considerable accession was made to the Catholic population of the empire; and when those usurpations had received a character of permanence, there were some regulations of the see of Rome, to settle the jurisdictions of the bishops of Poland, and so forth, within such limits, as would not interfere with the boundaries of those powers, to which they were severally subject.

In most places within the Russian dominions, as well in the Catholic as in the Russian churches, the liturgy is in the Sclavonian dialect. This was established by St. Methodius, after the death of his brother Cyril, by the authority of Pope John VIII., in the year 879, which custom was confirmed by Pope Urban VIII., and his successor Innocent X., about 1650; by the Synod of Zamoski, held in 1720, under Innocent XI., then by Pope Innocent XIII., and finally by Benedict XIV., (*Bullar. Const.* 98, 1744, and *Const. Ex pastorali munere,* 1754).

The Sclavonic is, probably, with the exception of the Arabic, the most extensive language extant; but its modern dialects are as different from the old mother tongue as any modern language is from those which are now called dead languages; and the liturgy in the Latin or Greek would be equally intelligible to the congregation as in the tongue which is used; but, by the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, no particular portion thereof has authority to change its discipline in a matter of such importance, without either the general consent of the whole body or of its head, that is, the bishops of the universal church, or the Bishop of Rome. And the same reasons which cause the retention of the other original languages, Latin, Greek, Coptic, and Syriac, or Chaldaic, which is the modern Hebrew, in the liturgies of several other portions of the Roman Catholic Church, operate with equal force, for retaining the old Sclavonic in Russia, and in the other countries where it was originally adopted.

A breviary and missal of this tongue, which had been revised and corrected by Caraman, afterwards Archbishop of Jadra, he having been

properly authorized, were printed in Rome in 1741: according to the rules of a dictionary of that language, titled *Azbuguiderium, i. e.*, A, b, c, derium. The best grammar thereof was compiled by Smotriski, a Basilian monk, and printed at Wilna in 1619—reprinted at Moscow in 1721.

Some of the churches in Poland and Moravia, which had originally received the Latin liturgy, about the year 1000, wished to use the Sclavonian liturgy, but upon the same principle which causes the retention of the Sclavonian, in those churches where it was originally established, a synod, held at Spalatro, under John, Archbishop of Salona, expressly prohibited its introduction to those churches. Maynard, the Pope's legate in those parts, forbid its use in any public office, to those churches and clergy who had previously used the Latin tongue. These decisions were confirmed by Pope Alexander II. Pope Gregory VII., the successor of Alexander, renewed the decree, applying it to the churches in Germany, which were, in like manner, omitting the Latin, and adopting the Sclavonian. Some ignorant would-be critics, who merely catch at the first glimpse of an apparent contradiction, to form a judgment, and to pronounce a condemnation, and some insidious men of ability, who oppose the Catholic church, quote these apparently conflicting decrees of those several Popes, and similar ones, as proofs of the instability of Catholic doctrine, and triumphantly ask, "Is this church infallible?" We really do not know how such men ought to be answered; for in the first place, it would be necessary to give them either honesty or information, or both. Had they these qualifications, they would acknowledge, that so far from being conflicting, these decrees proceed upon the same principle, but applied variously, under different circumstances; and next, Roman Catholics do not claim infallibility for the Pope in everything; nor for the church, except in doctrines of faith and morality; and these decrees do not regard either the doctrines of faith, or the principles of morality, which are immutable; but the regulation of discipline, which might, at any moment, be changed by proper authority.

In Russia, some of the churches have been planted by the missionaries from the east, and some by those from the west; each portion had its peculiar ceremonies and form of prayer, different from the other, though their doctrines of faith, their principles and morality, and their essential discipline, were exactly the same; those churches, generally, still retain, not only their original language, but also their original ceremonies and forms. Hence, amongst the Russian Catholics, great diversity of secondary discipline is observable. This has given rise to the assertions of some unskilful writers, who concluded, that there must be

a difference of belief, because there was a difference of external forms. As well might they conclude, that Jansenists were Roman Catholics, because all the external forms are similar. As well might they conclude, that the persons who frequent St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia, are in the communion of the Roman Catholic Church, because the young man who officiates therein observes the same forms as are observed by duly authorized Roman Catholic priests.

Communion in spirituals consists in believeing the same doctrines of faith, being united under the same church government, and obeying the authority of that government, and having, of course, the same sacraments. The Russian Catholic churches believe the same doctrines that are believed by all other Roman Catholic churches—they have the same sacraments that all other Roman Catholics have—and they are under the government of bishops, who hold communion with, and are subject to the Bishop of Rome, who is the centre of unity and communion for all Roman Catholics throughout the world. They acknowledge this authority, and they obey it;—though having been properly authorized therefor, their liturgical language, and their accidental ceremonies, which are matters of ecclesiastical discipline, differ from those of other churches. By not observing this distinction, between what is essentially necessary, and what is matter of conventional regulation, many superficial writers and readers have made egregious blunders; and by wilfully confusing what ought to be accurately distinguished, many ingenious sophists have created considerable delusion.

Hence, Russia exhibits in her Roman Catholic churches, perhaps the greatest diversity of discipline which could be observed in any other nation, if we except the city of Rome, where there are churches of all rites in communion with the Holy See. You will find Greek and Latin rites, in the Greek and Latin languages, and both in the old Sclavonian tongue, and the Armenian and Syriac rites, all used in several Roman Catholic churches, having different discipline, but holding the same faith, and subject to the same authority, and united in the common father of Christendom, the Bishop of Rome.

At present, there are in Russia, a legate of the Holy See, the Archbishop of Mohilow, and several bishops, the exact number we do not know, and a very considerable number of clergy of the several rites, and monks and friars of several orders, together with the faithful attached to them, in union with the Bishop of Rome, and the rest of the Roman Catholic churches; and during the last twenty or thirty years, notwithstanding the difficulties to conversion created by the laws, the

progress of Catholicity in this vast empire, has been and continues to be steady and considerable.

From the documents which we have been able to collect and to compare, we believe the following estimate will be found a pretty accurate representation of the religious situation of the European portion of Russia:

Various divisions of the Russian established and other similar churches, separated from the Holy See, about . .	20,000,000
Roman Catholics of various rites, ...	9,000,000
Lutherans, ...	3,000,000
Other Protestants, ...	1,500,000
Mahometans, ...	1,250,000
Pagans, ...	3,500,000
Total population of European Russia, ...	38,250,000

EUROPEAN TURKEY

SECTION I

What a contrast does this country now exhibit to what it once was! How faded in its religious glories! How debased its morality! What a series of instructive events does its history contain! The research of the antiquarian, the imagination of the poet, the investigation of the philosopher, the classic taste of the scholar, the reflection of the legislator, may all here find abundant employment. Here, too, the fragments which have escaped the unsparing hand of time, and the ravages of barbarism and avarice, still exhibit models for an age which boasts of its progress beyond those which have preceded it. Upon this soil liberty had its defenders. Thermistocles, and Miltiades, and Leonidas, are no more. Demosthenes has long been silent. The productions of Apelles are decayed, and where are the men? They have vanished from this world,—they exist in another. We have no ground for determining their fate. The God who searches the hearts of men, who alone could judge of the opportunities which he afforded them, and who alone could determine how they corresponded with those opportunities, has judged them, and has not revealed that judgment to us. It would, therefore, be rashness and presumption in us to pronounce upon the fate of others, without a sufficient motive to direct our judgment. We have not such a motive, neither are we constituted judges over these men; but our duty is, to labour strenuously in turning to account the opportunities afforded to ourselves. And in contemplating the history of religion in Greece, which is the present Turkey in Europe, we have a most instructive lesson for the direction of our conduct. We cannot dwell upon its events at present; we can only glance at the leading facts, and take future occasion to dilate upon them and explain each.

The Apostle St. Paul appears to have been the first Christian missionary in Greece, at least the first who founded churches and established bishops in the country.

We read in the xvi. of the *Acts of the Apostles*, that when St. Paul was at Troas in Lysia, he saw, in a dream, an inhabitant of Macedonia inviting him to go thither and help them; on which account, he sailed from Troas, and passing the island of Samothracia, he went to Neapo-

lis, which was upon the confines of Thrace in Macedon,—thence he went to Philippi, and subsequently to Amphipolis, Apollonia, and Thessalonica,—whence he was sent to Berœa, when he sailed to Athens, where he preached in the Areopagus; subsequently he established the church of Corinth.

After having left Greece in the year 53, churches having been established in those several places which we mentioned, he remained for some time in Asia; but, in the year 57, he again sailed from Troas for Macedon, to revisit his Grecian churches; and having written from Macedon his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he complains of some divisions and irregularities amongst them, answers some questions proposed by them concerning marriage and celibacy (chapter vii. and xi.), complains of some irregular practices at the time of receiving the holy eucharist, and states, that upon his arrival he will make a regulation upon the subject (v. 34). He was in Corinth in the year 58, when he wrote his epistle to the Romans; and St. Augustine informs [78] us, that it was then he made the regulation, that no person should receive the holy eucharist except fasting, unless in case of danger of death; which was immediately adopted as a general rule by the whole church, and has continued unchanged to the present day. In the next year St. Paul left Greece,—and the bishops whom he had established in the several churches zealously followed up his labours, and soon spread the light of the Gospel through that country.

Amongst the bishops who governed those churches, the most remarkable in the first and second ages, were St. Denis the Areopagite, first Bishop of Athens, appointed and consecrated by St. Paul to that charge in the year 51; St. Denis, Bishop of Corinth in the time of Pope Sotor, about the year 170; Publius, who was Bishop of Athens in the year 150; and his successor Quadratus, who was one of the first apologists for the Christians, he having drawn up and sent one to the Emperor Adrian; Athenogaras, an Athenian philosopher, who had been converted to Christianity, also presented an apology for the Christians in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.

Greece also gave many martyrs to the church in the succeeding ages,—but the blood of the martyrs only fertilized the soil of Christianity.

In the year 323, by the defeat of Licinius, Constantine the Great found himself at the head of the Roman Empire; and in that year, at Byzantium in Thrace, he had determined to consider of becoming a

[78] Ep. 118 ad. Jan.

Christian. He had not been altogether uninstructed in its principles, having imbibed them from his holy mother, St. Helena. Upon his arrival at Byzantium, he was waited upon by a deputation of Pagan philosophers, who represented to him the great evils that would flow from innovation, and the folly of changing from the faith of his fathers, and the possibility of serving God with a good heart under any system of religion. Alexander, the Bishop of Byzantium, was called before the emperor, and asked if he could answer their arguments. The bishop requested one to be selected to speak for all; and after he had commenced his train of reasoning, Alexander stated that he was no great logician, but the servant of a God of might, who could instantly confound human pride,—and commanded the philosopher, in the name of Jesus Christ, to be silent. He was struck dumb. Constantine immediately afterwards published edicts favourable to the Christians; and upon the site of Byzantium he raised the city which, after himself, he called Constantinople, —and which, from being the seat of the empire, was frequently called New Rome.

Arius, the author of an impious and blasphemous heresy in Alexandria, the Capital of Egypt, came to Constantinople to try and make interest with the emperor. Alexander refused to receive him into communion, or permit him to enter any of the churches of his diocess; but Arianism insinuated itself into Greece, and caused much calamity. Sometimes the emperors and courtiers upheld the Arians, and persecuted the Catholics. After the time of Constantine, the see of Constantinople was raised to the metropolitical dignity; it had been previously suffragan to the Archbishop of Heraclea in Thrace. An attempt was made in the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, to elevate its rank above every other see, except Rome; and by the contrivance of the clergy of Constantinople, and several of the sufiragans and neighbouring bishops, a canon to that effect was voted; it was the 28th; but St. Leo, who was then Pope, gave his sanction to the first 27, thereby excluding that which was the 28th, and a number of other canons which were irregularly passed after the departure of the legates, Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybum; Lucentius, Bishop of Ascoli, and Boniface, a priest of Rome, who presided in the name of St. Leo,—together with several other prelates. St. Protarius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, and the Bishops of Egypt, together with a considerable portion of the oriental prelates, also opposed this innovation; and for some time the Bishops of Constantinople relinquished their pretentions.

In the year 553, the second general council of Constantinople was held, and a new attempt was made to raise that see to the patriarchal

dignity, and to extend its jurisdiction. This was scarcely resisted, and Constantinople thenceforward ranked next in dignity to Rome.

We have, in the history of the Greek Church, which may be said principally to consist in the history of the see of Constantinople, one of the strongest and most melancholy exhibitions of the fatal consequences of the domination of worldly power over the affairs of the church; and in the exhibition of to-day, we have the confirmation of our assertion. If religion be made to depend for its support upon worldly means, or the power of princes or states, it will become the sport of human folly, and the prey of human passion. Constantinople was elevated to dignity by human power and worldly intrigue,—and those same causes have also produced its degradation.

Before the death of Alexander, bishop of that see, in 340, Paul, a native of Thessalonica, who had been a deacon of his church, was recommended by that prelate as his successor. He was regularly appointed and consecrated. But the Arian party were desirious of having one who would favour their views,—and accordingly they raised up Macedonius, one of their partisans, to be his competitor. The Emperor Constantius banished Paul and Macedonius, and invited Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, to govern that see. Thus, we perceive how soon worldly domination began to exhibit itself upon the profession of the faith by the emperors, and how quickly they found amongst the clergy willing instruments. Paul took refuge with St. Maximinus, Bishop of Triers in Gaul, whence he proceeded to Rome, for the purpose of laying his case before the Pope; here he found St. Athanasius, who had come for a like purpose, under similar circurstances, having been driven from his see of Alexandria, in Egypt, by the Arians also.

Pope Julius I. was holding a synod, which was attended by eighty bishops; and after examining the cases of Athanasius and Paul, he restored them to their sees, and sent them back with letters of injunction to their flocks. Eusebius, however, kept forcible possession of the see of Constantinople until his death, about nine or ten months after. The Arians had gained considerable sway over Constantius, and again procured the banishment of Paul.

Hermogenes, his general, was ordered by Constantius, who was in Antioch, upon his way to Thrace, to pass by Constantinople, and to drive Paul out of the city. The people resisted the general, and he was slain. Constantius came to the city, pardoned the people, and banished the bishop. Paul, upon his own application, and at the request of the Pope, received, in 344, letters from Constans, the emperor of the West, to his brother Constantius, requesting he would suffer the bishop to re-

main in his see, for the government of his church. Thus, he was enabled to remain until 350, when, Constans dying, his enemies succeeded in procuring his banishment, and he died in 351, having been strangled in prison in Cucusus, a small town in a most unhealthy situation in the deserts of Mount Taurus, upon the confines of Cappadocia and Armenia, having been previously left six days without food in his dungeon.

Philip, the prefect of the Pretorian band, was the officer commissioned to remove Paul from his see,—and knowing the facility of exciting a tumult in Constantinople, he, though an Arian, privately sent for Paul, and showed him the order for his banishment, requesting that, to preserve peace, he would quietly obey. Meantime a crowd had assembled outside the bath where the bishop and the prefect conversed. The bishop, seeing contention useless, consented,—and the prefect caused a passage to be privately broken through the rear of the building, through which the bishop escaped, and lay concealed in the palace until he was embarked for the place of his destiny.

Philip next proceedeed to fulfil the other part of his commission, and took Macedonius in state to be installed in the cathedral. The Catholics and the Novatians united in their opposition, blocked up the passages, and refused to make way; the military were brought out, and upwards of three thousand persons were killed on both sides. The prefect conducted Macedonius into the church, and placed him in possession of the episcopal throne. The intruder now turned his attention to annoy the Novatians, and finding they were pretty numerous in Paphlagonia, he procured an order from the emperor to have four regiments sent to compel them to embrace Arianism. The Paphagonians prepared for the contest, and the soldiers were nearly all cut to pieces.

Upon a subsequent occasion he was opposed by the people in an attempt to remove the body of Constantine from the Church of the Apostles to that of St. Acacius, which caused dreadful carnage in the churches. The emperor, at length, weary of the repetition of these scenes, undertook to depose him. Macedonius now hated the Arians equally as he did the Catholics. The former denied the divinity of the Son of God,—the latter believed in the divinity of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Macedonius, in order to oppose both, asserted the divinity of the Son, and denied that of the Holy Ghost,—thus forming a new sect, which, after him, were called *Macedonians* and *Pneumatomachics*, and other times *Marathonians*; the first name they derived from their founder—the second from the peculiariay of their doctrine, "opposers of the Holy Ghost"—the third from Marathon,

Bishop of Nicomedia, who was a principal abettor of their errors, and without whose aid it is supposed the sect never would have been formed. This error spread principally through Thrace, along the shores of the Hellespont, and in Bithynia, and was condemned in the first Council of Constantinople in 381.

The perpetual interference of the emperors and their officers, who sometimes were Catholics, and sometimes members of some one of the various new heresies which were perpetually ravaging the Church of Constantinople, together with the restless spirit of its population, caused the greatest disorders and irregularities in this church. St. John Chrysostom, and St. Gregory Nazianzen, two of the brightest ornaments of the Christian world, were bishops of this see, and suffered the greatest persecutions and afflictions for their attempts to preserve church discipline.

At the Council in 381, the title of St. Gregory Nazianzen to the see of Constantinople was recognised,—but, finding that he could not preserve peace of the church consistently with its discipline, he resigned, and was succeeded by Nectarius. The emperor wrote to the Pope, requesting that, for the sake of peace, he would confirm these acts.

SECTION II

We have merely glanced at the prominent facts which the early history of this portion of the church exhibits. We have seen, however, that Byzantium was an episcopal see, subject to the Archbishop of Heraclea, in Thrace, and that although this town was by Constantine enlarged and ornamented, and raised to the dignity of a capital of the empire, this made no change in the bishop's title, until subsequently, after much exertion, first it was raised to be an archbishopric, then began to lay claim to the patriarchial dignity, not from any allegation of original divine right, but from the concession of some councils, and the voluntary submission of some bishops. Still, however, in the year 381, this claim was not recognised by Rome, nor genarally admitted.

In the year 381, a provincial council was held in that city, at which St. Meletius, Patriarch of Antioch, presided, and during the celebration of which he died. He was held in such esteem for his sanctity, that the people pressed round the dead body to touch it with linen, which they afterwards preserved as relics. The acts of this council were afterwards received by the whole church, and thus it has the authority of a general council, from its acceptation.

The second canon of this council regulates the discipline of jurisdic-

tion and boundary, prohibiting the bishops from creating confusion by interfering in the concerns of other churches, and renews the decisions of the Council of Nice by forming the provinces, stating that Alexandria should govern the province of Egypt; the Eastern bishops should regulate their own discipline, paying due honour to the primacy of the church of Antioch, according to the Nicene statutes; the bishops of Asia Minor should also regulate their own discipline; those of Pontus that of their province, and the bishops of Thrace that of this province. This canon is found also in its proper place in the code of canon law, (9 qu. 2 cap. *Episcopi qui extra*). The thirty-fourth of the apostolic canons had previously made a similar enactment, so far only as regarded ordinations, under the penalty of deposition of the person ordaining, and of those ordained. The Greek copy of this canon of Constantinople has a paragraph which is not found in the Latin copy, regulating, that "the churches amongst the barbarians shall be administered according to the custom of the fathers, which has been preserved."

The canon of the Council of Nice, principally referred to, is the sixth. The fifteenth and sixteenth have also a bearing upon the case. Gratian quotes a canon of the Council of Antioch, held in 341, under Julius I., to the same effect. (Cap. *Episcopum non debere*, 9 quæst 9; in others quæst. 2). This was the thirteenth canon of Antioch; and in the twenty-second of the same synod, the principle was applied to special cases. This Council of Antioch was far from being general, and some of its canons were rejected; but the thirteenth and twenty-second are amongst those received and confirmed, as having been founded upon the principle of the canon of the general Council of Nice, and confirmed by the first Council of Constantinople, which became general by acceptation; and in the year 410, Pope Innocent I., who rejected some of the canons of this council, and admitted others, received and confirmed the thirteenth and twenty-second. It was upheld by several other decisions during upwards of eleven hundred years; it was finally ratified by the Council of Trent, when that council remodelled the discipline, and repealed a considerable portion of the canons of the preceding ages. In the sixth session, held on the 13th of January, 1547, the fifth canon of Reformation, which was the last canon of that session, re-enacts and confirms the principle of the second canon of the first Council of Constantinople, with a penalty similar to that of the thirty-fourth apostolic canon, and the editor quotes as precedents those two canons, together with those of Nice and Antioch; the thirteenth of the second Council of Arles, about 442; the third and nineteenth canons of the Council of Sardica, in the year 347, under the famous Osius, Bishop

of Cordova, and the fifteenth canon of the third Council of Orleans, held in 538.

There was, however, a special object in passing this second canon at Constantinople, which was only exhibited by the production of the third canon. Thrace having been now made a province, and placed upon an equality with Egypt and the province of Antioch, there having been also a number of new provinces created, which were not previously known, the next regulation should concern their rank. In Nice, the only patriarchates recognised were Antioch, which had formerly been the see of Peter, and Alexandria, which was the see of his disciple St. Mark. Other provinces of minor note were referred to, without being named; but now we find not only Antioch and Alexandria, but we also find Asia Minor, Pontus, and Thrace.

The third canon then proceeds to give Constantinople the first rank amongst those, and enacts, "Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the first place of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome."

This canon was not approved of by the Pope, nor was it accepted together with the other canons in the west, nor in Egypt, though it was partially received in Syria and in Asia Minor. The patriarchate of Antioch did not comprehend Thrace. That country was in the western patriarchate, which upon two grounds, therefore, required the assent of the Bishop of Rome, for any change in territorial jurisdiction or precedence, first as patriarch of that special district, and next as head of the whole church: yet, though it was not ratified by him, it was acted upon voluntarily by those who enacted it; and we find also the second canon violated almost immediately, for the Bishop of Constantinople not only governed Thrace, but interfered in Pontus and Asia Minor, and part of Antioch; and the emperors who were anxious to add as much as possible to the splendour of the new imperial city, gave their countenance and support to the usurpation; but to this day, the consequences of endeavouring to create and uphold spiritual power by such means, have destroyed religion in this miserable church.

About this time, the errors of Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, made some progress in the churches of Greece. The principle of his error was found in the doctrines of Pythagorean philosophy. The reputed sage had taught that man had two souls, the rational and the sensitive, the one a pure spirit which possessed the higher powers of our nature, the other a nondescript substance, which was the receptacle of sensation and the seat of passion. Apollinaris taught that Christ had the sensitive soul, but not the rational soul, the existence of which he con-

tended would be useless, in consequence of the union of the divinity. St. Gregory Nazianzen, who had abdicated the see of Constantinople, which was now governed by Nectarius, opposed this error in the East, and St. Ambrose of Milan, wrote against it in the West, and St. Anathasius in Africa.

The successor of Nectarius was St. John Chrysostom. This holy man used all the influence of his zeal, his eloquence and his piety, to restore the discipline of the church, but the power of the court was too strong, and his efforts were unavailing. The Empress Eudoxia always found a sufficient number of the clergy ready to aid her in her projects of persecution against a prelate who was alike unmoved by the threats of power, or the blandishments of luxury; he was frequently banished for the discarge of duty and as often recalled. On Easter eve, A. D. 404, four hundred soldiers attacked the faithful who followed him to a private chapel, where he was baptizing the catechumens, as he could not consistently with the principles of the church go into the cathedral; vast numbers were slain, the baptismal fonts filled with blood, the very eucharist trampled under foot by savages who called themselves Catholics. The holy bishop ended his days in exile, from the hardships he endured on his transportation to Armenia, in the month of September, 407.

Arsacius, brother to Nectarius, the former prelate, was intruded upon the church, but Pope Innocent I. refused to recognise or to receive him into communion, and he was supported by the court. This was the first schism between the Latin and Greek churches. Fourteen months after this, Atticus, an Armenian monk, was promoted to this see, and was received into communion upon his erasing from the dyptics of his church the name of Arsacius, and substituting that of John Chrysostom, which the usurper had erased. The church of Alexandria had the misfortune to have at its head previously to this, Theophilus, the worst enemy of St. John Chrysostom; he was succeeded by his nephew, Cyril, who made a similar change in the dyptics of Alexandria to that which Atticus made in those of Constantinople. Atticus was succeeded by Sisinnius; and after his death, Nestorius was brought thither from Antioch, in 428.

SECTION III

Scarcely was Nestorius fixed in his see, when he began to introduce erroneous doctrines which he had imbibed from Theodore of Mopsuestia. He taught in his cathedral that Christ had two persons as he

had two natures, and therefore, that the expression which was usual amongst Christians when speaking of the blessed Virgin, was incorrect—that they should not style her *Mother of God,* because she was only mother of the human person, but not of the divine person. The people rose up instantly and interrupted him in the midst of his discourse, stating that he was changing their doctrines, and that if an angel from heaven were to preach a different doctrine from what they had received from Jesus Christ through the Apostles and their successors, they could not receive it, for they were bound to believe the revelations of God, and it would be impiety to believe doctrines contradictory to what Jesus Christ delivered.

Theodore of Mopsuestia fell into his error by too violently opposing Apollinaris. Nestorius carried the false principles of Theodore to farther results than his teacher, and thus in their consequences proved their falsehood. Besides endeavouring to abolish the expression respecting the blessed Virgin, which had been always known in the church, Nestorius endeavoured also to abolish other phrases equally consecrated by truth and usage, and which the pagans cited as proofs of the folly of Christianity. "A God has died," "God has suffered." Nestorius stated that those expressions arose from a mistake of the doctrine, but his flock contended that their belief was correct, and his doctrine a novelty.

The new archbishop was in high favour at court, and immediately procured the aid of the civil and military power for his support, but the people would not change their faith; and as every error will necessarily create opposition, and that opposition create noise and tumult, not only was this wretched church now torn into factions, but these also communicated their feelings and opinions to their neighbours, so that all Greece and a considerable portion of Asia and Egypt became embroiled. St. Cyril, the Patriarch of Alexandria, having been consulted by some of the monks of his district, decided that the Archbishop of Constantinople had erred. Nestorius had the decision of Cyril answered by Photius, to which Cyril replied, and now the contest was violent.

Acacius, Bishop of Berea, and John, the Patriarch of Antioch, condemned Nestorius, but were of opinion that Cyril was too violent. Cyril and Nestorius had both written to Pope Celestin, who held a provincial council at Rome, in which Nestorianism was condemned, as it was also in a provincial council held by Cyril in Egypt. Nestorius retorted its own anathemas upon the Synod of Alexandria, and appealed to a general council. This general council was held at Ephesus in 431, and Nestorius was condemned there; after which, the more strongly to

mark their faith, the Catholics took every occasion of using the very phrases which Nestorius strove to abolish—"Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now, and at the hour of our death," and so forth. Nestorius, having been deposed, retired to a monastery, but did not embrace the true faith; the Emperor Theodosius the younger, prohibited the assemblies of the Nestorians, and banished numbers of them, who went principally to Persia and Syria.

This same Theodosius had the relics of St. John Chrysostom brought with great pomp from the East to Constantinople, in the time of Proclus, the successor of Nestorius. Flavian succeeded Proclus, and in his time another heresy originated in this city. Eutyches, the archimandrite or abbot of a monastery near Constantinople was its author.

The rage of opposition to Nestorianism was such amongst this speculative and hot-headed people, that it was easy to lead them to the other extreme. Nothing was wanted but a leader, and Eutyches was fitted for that post. Austere and mortified, his appearance of sanctity together with the situation which he held, gave him weight with the multitude, who were greatly taken with the vehemence of his declamations against Nestorianism. He was more headstrong and obstinate than intelligent or well informed, and he was held in some estimation at court. His spirit had also something of a disposition to persecute, and he is looked upon to have been a promoter of the severities inflicted upon the Nestorians.

Eutyches inveighed against the impiety of those who dared to say that in Jesus Christ there were two persons, when there were not even two natures; for although the Son of God assumed our nature, in him it was destroyed, and it was no longer human nature after the personal union, Jesus Christ had then but one person and one nature. The Nestorian denied that Christ was one person possessing two natures. Eutyches denied that Christ had two natures in one person. The Catholic Church has always taught, that in Christ there are two natures, the divine and human, united in one person. The errors of Eutyches were spread through several monasteries, and found their way into Egypt and the East. Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylea, who had been one of the earliest opponents of Nestorius, was also one of the first to detest the error of Eutyches; and finding his remonstrances with the archimandrite unavailing, he presented a formal complaint for heresy, without specifying the tenets against him, to Flavian, who then presided in a synod at Constantinople, which was held to regulate a dispute between the Metropolitan of Lydia and two of his suffragans.

The abbot was summoned to attend, but feigned several excuses,

and had it privately whispered through the monasteries that Flavian was a tyrant, who would not admit him to communion unless he signed a paper which he did not understand. Being obliged to appear before the synod, he was convicted; but availing himself of his credit at court, he obtained through the emperor an order for a council at Ephesus. Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, assumed the presidency, and together with a small party which was attached to Eutyches, he disregarded the authority of the papal legates who came to preside, deposed Flavian and those who had suspended and condemned the archimandrite. Him they restored, and then finding the majority of bishops to be opposed to their acts, Dioscorus introduced the army, which was at his command. The orthodox bishops protested against this violence, but the opposite party cried out to put down their opponents. Flavian was trodden to such a state as soon produced his death, and others with difficulty escaped. None of the acts of this horrid assembly have been received by the church. Pope St. Leo condemned this synod, and did all he could to prevail on Theodosius to suffer a proper council to assemble, but he would not consent. The Pope saw it would be useless to convoke it in opposition to the wishes of the emperor; but Theodosius soon dying, Marcian, his successor, afforded every facility, and a general council was held at Chalcedon, in which Eutyches was condemned, in the year 451. This was the fourth general council, and Dioscorus was deposed and banished.

Anatolius contrived to get into the see of Constantinople, after the death of Flavian; and his ambition urged him in the Council of Chalcedon to attempt elevating the rank of Constantinople. Favoured by the court and a considerable number of the bishops, a resolution was obtained in one of the sessions, after the regular business had been disposed of, by which resolution it was agreed, "That since the church of Constantinople has the honour equally with Rome of being an imperial city, and the seat of a senate, it ought to enjoy equal privilege and dignity with the Church of Rome, and therefore the provinces of Pontus and Asia and Thrace ought to belong to its jurisdiction, and be subject to the Bishop of Constantinople, and that their metropolitans should thenceforward be consecrated at Constantinople."

But when this was read in presence of the legates, they immediately rejected and condemned it, stating that their instructions from the Pope upon the subject, were clear and definite.

The fathers who had agreed to it were farther prevailed upon to write to the Pope, requesting he would confirm what his legates had refused to sanction, and their own words will exhibit the influence which

was employed. After stating their condemnation of Eutyches in conformity with the wishes of the Pope, and concurring with his legates they continue, "We have thought fit to regulate some points of discipline, for the peace and welfare of the church, in giving to the Bishop of Constantinople the next rank after Rome, but your legates have opposed it—though we have only in this confirmed the judgment of the one hundred and fifty bishops assembled in Constantinople in the reign of Theodosius the Great, which bishops decreed also, that the Bishop of Constantinople should have privilege next after your holy see. In opposing it, we suppose your legates were only moved by the desire of leaving to you the honour of doing personally this act, which is to insure the peace of the church. In our decree we have been influenced by the wish of the emperor, the desire of the senate, and the request of the whole imperial city. By your confirmation you will insure the everlasting gratitude and strict adherence of the See of Constantinople. And as the credit of the good actions of children redound to the glory of their father, we pray you to honour our decrees by your judgment; and as we, your children, have joined in your judgment of faith, so you, our head, may in return concur in the regulation which we have originated as productive of great good. By so doing, you will also highly gratify the emperor and the imperial city."

St. Leo refused his sanction, and wrote to the emperor and to his religious empress, and to the Archbishop of Constantinople, expostulating with them and giving the reasons for his refusal, stating, amongst others, that the civil dignity of a city was no ground for its ecclesiastical pre-eminence. It may also be remarked, that in this council there was no Patriarch of Alexandria to make opposition, for in the very first session Dioscorus had been deposed. Juvenal of Jerusalem held but an honorary distinction void of jurisdiction, and Maximus of Antioch did not appear to interest himself; for by giving Pontus and Asia proper to Constantinople, together with Thrace, there was no encroachment upon his jurisdiction, as it did not extend north of Mount Taurus and the river Tigris; but the bishops of the province of Ephesus strongly opposed it. Another remark proper to be made here is, that even at this period Greece proper, which is the ancient Peloponnesus and Achaia, together with Macedonia, Epirus, and Illyricum, were not in the patriarchate formed or intended to be formed for Constantinople, but were in the western patriarchate, of which Thrace was originally a portion.

Though the canons by which it was hitherto attempted to raise Constantinople, were thus rendered invalid, still they were not inoperative. The ambition of the emperors and their courtiers, and sometimes

the ambition and sometimes the weakness of the archbishops of the new imperial city, joined to the submission of the bishops of the new division, gave virtually an efficacy to the regulation. Anatolius exercised the power by the consent sometimes of those over whom he claimed jurisdiction, and at other times aided by the civil power, he compelled submission. This introduction of the civil power to cause the execution of ecclesiastical decrees, has been the ruin of church discipline, and has laid the foundation of the intermeddling of kings and emperors with church concerns, and has been productive, upon the whole, of incalculable mischief.

After the death of Anatolius, Gennadius, a good and pious bishop, governed the Church of Constantinople during a few years, and upon his death, in 471, Acacius, a bishop of a very different character, occupied his place.

The Emperor Marcian died in 457, and was succeeded by Leo Macelles, who reigned until 474, when he was succeeded by Zeno the Isaurian, who filled the throne until 491, with the exception of the period that Basiliscus tyrannized in Constantinople, during the temporary abdication of Zeno and his flight into Isauria.

During that period the dreadful effects of this new interference in ecclesiastical concerns exhibited themselves. When the Christians were persecuted by the emperors, religion was preserved pure and uncontaminated; but when the emperors became the protectors of the church, and the union of church and state was formed, bishops became courtiers, and the episcopacy was now a place of less trouble, less danger, less privation, more honour, more wealth, and more influence. Courtiers regulated church affairs by the principles of human policy, and the church was agitated by the concussions of the state. The ignorance of Leo, the vacillating tyranny of Basiliscus, and the officious interference of Zeno, under the guidance of the wily Acacius, threw everything into confusion; there was scarcely a see in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, whose bishop was not exiled or deposed by one or other of those three rulers; and persecution for difference of faith began to be formally introduced into Christianity.

Leo was orthodox, but ignorant; Zeno cared nothing for religion, and plundered his subjects, whilst the barbarians ravaged his provinces with impunity. He having fled to avoid the rage of the people, Basiliscus, brother-in-law to Leo, usurped the throne; he wished to make a party, and finding many Eutychians to whom he was attached, he condemned the Council of Chalcedon, and banished and deposed several bishops who refused to sign his act of condemnation. After two years,

upon the return of Zeno, he was sent by him into Cappadocia, where he and his wife and children were put into a castle, the apertures of which were built up, and the unhappy inmates left there to starve. Zeno undid all that Basiliscus had done, and deposed those whom he had favoured. But the Catholics and Eutychians had now come to violent opposition. To try and reconcile both parties, Acacius recommended to the emperor to publish an edict, in which the exposition of the Catholic faith concerning the incarnation was accurately given; but to gratify the Eutychians, no mention was made of the Council of Chalcedon, or of its decrees. This edict was called *Henotikon*, or edict of union. The Eutychians refused to embrace its doctrines—the Catholics refused to treat a general council with disrespect. Acacius advised Zeno to punish both. The emperor followed his advice, and banished most of the bishops of the empire, persecuting both sides most unsparingly. This is the first instance we find on record of monarchs regulating the doctrines of religion.

Pope St. Leo died in 461, and was succeeded by St. Hilary, who died in 470. His successor was St. Simplicius, who died in 483, and was succeeded by Felix III. This Pope sent three legates, Vitalis and Misenus, bishops, and Felix, to Constantinople, to remonstrate against this persecution, to have the edict withdrawn, and to prevail upon the emperor to withdraw his support from Peter Moggus, the unprincipled Patriarch of Alexandria. Acacius had so completely gained upon the emperor, that he had the legates thrown into prison, and then succeeded in bringing the two bishops to enter into communion with Peter Moggus. The Pope assembled a council in Rome, deposed his legates and excommunicated Acacius, who in return excommunicated the Pope. This began the second schism of Constantinople.

Acacius died in 488, and was succeeded by Flavita, who not only was a schismatic but a heretic. The wretched people were now divided into three parties, the Catholics, the Eutychians, and a middle party called the Doubtful—all irreconcilable. Flavita was soon succeeded by Euphemius, who held the Catholic faith, and received the Council of Chalcedon, but he found the district in a miserable situation. Acacius had, in revenge for the excommunication of Felix, deposed most of the orthodox bishops, and Flavita was anxious to fill their places with Eutychians, so that the faith was lost in many of the churches. Euphemius wrote to Pope Gelasius, the successor of Felix, who died in 492, that he condemned Dioscorus and received the Council of Chalcedon, praying to be received into communion. Gelasius required the name of Acacius to be taken off the dyptics of Constantinople, and that of Felix to be

inserted. Euphemius refused to comply with the first part, but willingly offered to comply with the second part of the requisition. Gelasius, therefore, refused him communion, and the schism continued. Meantime Zeno was succeeded in the empire by Anastatius I., who at first punished all the parties, but subsequently attaching himself to the Eutychians, he deposed and banished Euphemius, and had Macedonius substituted for him by some bishops, whom he procured for the purpose. The schism continued under Macedonius, though his faith was orthodox. Anastatius soon found means, as he had inclination, and deposed and banished Macedonius, as also Flavian of Antioch, and Elias of Jerusalem, for holding to the Council of Chalcedon. St. Sabas the Abbot, and other holy men, remonstrated with the emperor, who desisted a little from his persecution, and a profession of faith and petition for communion was sent to Pope Symmachus by most of the churches, stating that they thought it hard to be punished for the fault of Acacius. The Pope answered that the profession was orthodox, but that they should acknowledge also the propriety of the condemnation of him whose crime they acknowledged.

Meantime Vitalian, a Scythian, raising a vast body of troops, under pretence of defending the Catholic faith, overran Scythia and Mysia, penetrated through Thrace, and laid siege to Constantinople. The emperor promised to reunite himself to Rome, and the troops withdrew. He applied to Pope Hormisdas, who required the same conditions as his predecessors had. The emperor refused, but many of the bishops and monasteries acceded, and were reconciled. St. Sabas and a number of other holy men again applied to the emperor, and he appeared to relent, but still delayed. He died in the year 518, in the 88th year of his age, and was succeeded by Justinus I.; and in the year 519, through his intervention, the names of Acacius and Flavita, Euphemius and Macedonius, were taken off the dyptics, the faith of Chalcedon restored, and an end put to the schism.

SECTION IV

After the reconciliation with Rome in 519, there was a considerable calm in the Church of Constantinople. The Emperor Justin I. dying in 527, was succeeded by Justinian I., his nephew, whose wife Theodora was a Eutychian. This emperor had a religious turn, and a great propensity for legislation, the union of both which qualities in a person possessed of his authority, made him a torment to the church. He was at the commencement of his reign a Roman Catholic, and not only

religious, but austere and mortified. He devoted very little time to his meals, and very little to sleep. He frequently fasted two days upon one poor meal of wild herbs and other vegetables. He soon commenced theologian and ecclesiastical legislator. He is the first prince that we find usurping this power; but his first edicts, though regarding ecclesiastical persons, had more the appearance of civil than of ecclesiastical legislation; on which account the usurpation did not wear so obnoxious an aspect as to require strenuous opposition, especially in the unsettled state of that portion of the church; besides, the object of the edicts was evidently good and necessary, and the execution of the law was committed to the patriarch, and through him to the metropolitans. He also published a profession of faith, which contained the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and on this account was pretty generally subscribed. He manifested great zeal for the conversion of heretics and infidels, and brought many to the external profession of the faith, though most persons agree that he made more hypocrites than converts; and indeed the means which he used, viz., rewards and punishments, were better calculated to produce hypocrisy than conviction. Some persons go so far as to say that he had an interest in those persecutions, for that he put into his private coffers the proceeds of the confiscations to which he subjected the obstinate.

The Eutychians having caused great trouble at Alexandria in Egypt, and even caused a schism amongst the Catholics, the emperor had a conference between six Catholic and six schismatical bishops in his palace, the result of which was the reconciliation of one of the schismatical prelates and some of the clergy, and the exasperation of the others. Justinian drew up a formulary of faith anew, and sent it to the Pope, John I., a successor of Hormisdas, requesting him, as "the head of all the bishops," to confirm it. This form contained a clear exposition of the true faith, and was approved of by the Pope in 529, and subscribed by most of the oriental bishops.

Justinian was desirous of reducing the laws of the empire into a better form than they were in, and for that purpose employed some of the ablest lawyers and chief officers of his time.

In 529, he published the *Code*, so called, as being the book which contained the select constitutions of the preceding emperors and his own, which he wished to preserve in force; and in 534 a more correct and improved selection was set forth. In 533 the best decisions of the lawyers upon cases under those constitutions were published under the title of *Digests*, or *Pandects*, and this was immediately followed by four books of Institutes, or introduction to the study and application of this

law, and those decisions.—There was an appendix called *Novellæ*, which principally consisted of ecclesiastical laws compiled in like manner, and of several laws of his own or modern enactment. The entire of this forms what is called the *Civil or Justinian Code.* Many of the ecclesiastical regulations were never received by the church, and several that were received, have been subsequently repealed by contrary usage, by disuse, or by repeal, or by the enactments of canons which are inconsistent with the entries of the *Novellæ.* Such as were of force at any time received their authority not from the enactment of Justinian, but from the acceptation of the church. One of the principal topics in this appendix regarded the appointment of bishops. Some of the eastern churches received the discipline there laid down, but very few in the west acted on it.

The discipline in the western church was principally founded upon the canons of the Apostles. The canons of the Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, which were general, and of the provincial councils of Ancyra, the capital of Galatia in Asia Minor, held in 314; Gangres, the capital of Paphlagonia, held in 470; Neocesarea in Cappadocia, now called Tocat, held about the year 315; three Councils of Antioch in Syria, in 265, 359, and 452; Laodicea, in Phrygia, in the time of Pope Damasus, and some others, found in the collection of Dionysius the Little, a Scythian monk, who became a priest of the Church of Rome, of eminent piety and literature, and who in 520 published the first collection of canon law, to which, a few years afterwards, he added the Decretals of the Popes Siricius, Innocent I., Zozimus, Boniface I., Celestin I., Leo the Great, Gelasius I., and Anastasius II. This same Dionysius was an excellent arithmetician and astronomer; he renewed the computation of the cycle, that of St. Cyril having nearly expired, and substituted the computation by the Christian era for that of consulates, and other modes of keeping account. Many persons are of opinion, however, that he fell into a mistake, which has never been corrected, of four years in the assignment of the exact period of the incarnation.

Another remark is also necessary upon the *Novellæ*, and indeed upon the whole Justinian code. We have before noticed the conduct of Justinian in compelling persons to profess a faith to which they were not attached. This had produced many bad results, amongst which that now adverted to was not trivial. Tribonian, a heathen, who pretended to be a Christian, was questor, which office is nearly the same as a judge in equity; this man, who was one of the best lawyers of the age, was by no means as upright as he was learned. Procopius and Suidas accuse

him of having been excessively corrupt and venal. He was one of the chief compilers of the Pandects, and editors of the *Novellæ*, and frequently exhibited in them how little he was influenced by the principles of that religion which his interest obliged him to profess against his conviction.

We have stated before that the Empress Theodora was a Eutychian. But like all heresies, the Eutychian was now divided into several minor sects, a considerable one of which was called that of the Acephalists; they were obstinate opponents of the Council of Chalcedon. To this sect the empress specially attached herself. Upon the death of Epiphanius the patriarch, in 535, she contrived to have Anthimus, who was a member of this sect, raised to the see of Constantinople from the see of Trebisond, which he had previously filled.

St. Agapetus, who had succeeded John II. in the See of Rome, was consecrated on the 4th of May, 535, and at the request of Theodotus, King of the Goths in Italy, went to Constantinople for the purpose of endeavouring to dissuade Justinian from sending an expedition to recover Italy. In this he failed; but the Catholics of the imperial city accused their patriarch of heresy. Agapetus refused to receive Anthimus into communion, unless he subscribed the decrees of Chalcedon, and complained of the irregularity of his translation from Trebisond. The emperor and empress used their influence in vain with the Pope to allow the translation to stand valid. Anthimus returned to his former see, and the Pope consecrated Mennas patriarch of the imperial city, and excommunicated Anthimus, unless he would subscribe the decrees of Chalcedon. This created for the Pope the enmity of the empress and all her adherents. Agapetus died at Constantinople on April 18, A. D. 536, and his body was brought to Rome for interment.

Upon the death of St. Agapetus, Silverius, son of Pope Hormisdas, who had been married previous to his ordination, was consecrated upon the 8th of June, 536. Belisarius, the general of Justinian, having made himself master of Sicily in 535, took Naples in 536; and marching towards Rome, that city was, at the request of Pope Silverius, delivered up to him. The empress looked upon this as a good opportunity of promoting her views; wrote to the Pope, requiring him either to acknowledge Anthimus bishop of Constantinople, or to proceed to that city and examine his cause. Upon the receipt of the letter Silverius remarked, that packet would cost him his life. He wrote back that he could not betray the cause of the Catholic faith.

At this time Vigilius, one of the archdeacons of the Roman Church, who had accompanied the late Pope, was still at Constantinople. The

empress promised to have him made Pope, as Rome was now in her power, and to bestow upon him a large sum of money, provided he would condemn the Council of Chalcedon, and restore to communion Anthimus, who was to be reinstated in Constantinople, and Severus and Theodosius, the Eutychian patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. The conditions were acceded to, and Vigilius set off for Rome, with a letter to Belisarius, commanding him to banish Silverius, and have Vigilius placed in his stead. Constantinople had long felt the evils of a connexion with the state; and the melancholy review which we have already made shows but too evidently the terrible effects of this unnatural and demoralizing association. This was the first attempt upon the See of Rome by the same agents.

Belisarius showed great reluctance to execute this commission; but his wife, Antonina, who was a confident and favourite of the empress, had a great ascendancy over him, and prevailed. "The empress commands me," said the general, "I must obey." "He who seeks the ruin of Silverius, and not I, shall answer for it at the last day." The Pope was accused, to afford a pretext for executing the order, of having held a treasonable correspondence with Vitiges the Goth, who was raised to the throne in place of Theodotus, who was deposed. To prove this, a letter was produced as from the Pope, inviting Vitiges to attack the city, and he would open its gates. It was proved that this letter was forged by Marcus, a lawyer, and Julianus, a military man, who had been suborned by the empress's friends. Belisarius entreated the Pope to comply with the request of his mistress, and not place him under the necessity of doing what he said was his duty. The Pope declared that he could not abandon his own duty, and that the power of rulers could not justify him before God. He then took refuge in the church of St. Sabina. The general contrived to get him out of the church, and had him privately removed; and Vigilius was consecrated on the 22d of November, 537, it being published that Silverius had voluntarily resigned. The good Pope was removed to Palmeria, in Lycia, the bishop of which place treated him with kindness due to the father of the faithful, and obtained from the emperor an order for his restoration, unless he could be proved guilty of high treason. The executioners of the empress's orders contrived his detention in the little island of Palmaria, where he died, some say of ill treatment, others by the hand of an assassin, on the 20th of June, 538.

Vigilius repented of his crimes, and though theretofore an intruder, was now confirmed in his place, [and] became the successor not only

to the dignity, but to the firm orthodoxy of Silverius, so that the designs of Theodora were frustrated.

Still, however, Justian, could not refrain from interfering in the concerns of the church; and the opponents of Catholicity, amongst whom his wife was the most restless, and not the least artful, took advantage of this propensity. Justinian had a council held under Mennas, in which laws were passed anew against the Nestorians and several sects of Eutychians; and the emperor persecuted all who would not receive those laws. Changing their appellation, some of those proscribed sectaries now took up the doctrines of Origen; and an application was made to the emperor, who actually neglected the government of the empire to get entangled in theological broils, to have them condemned. He drew up a new edict, in which he divided the errors of Origen into classes, ranged them under six heads, and condemned them. He sent a copy of this to Mennas, requiring him to have the bishops of his patriarchate and their abbots to subscribe thereto, and informs him that he had sent a copy to Pope Vigilius, and to the other patriarchs, for the same purpose. The edict contained no error, and was received and subscribed. And whilst his majesty was thus employed, Chosroes, King of Persia, was ravaging his eastern territories with impunity. Nor could the daily accounts of successive disasters withdraw him from ecclesiasitcal legislation.

Amongst the insincere subscribers to the edict which condemned the errors of Origen, one of the principal was Theodore Ascidas, visitor or exarch of [the] New Laura, founded by St. Sabas the abbot, in 507. This man afterwards contrived to obtain the bishopric of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and became the rallying point of the Origenist Eutychians. He was a man of consumate artifice and unexcelled hypocrisy. Being on good terms with Justinian, and favoured by Theodora, he devised a mode of, as he thought, covertly destroying the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. He told the emperor that if, instead of publishing edicts of condemnation against the Acephalists and other Eutychians, he would only have the Nestorians who were condemned at Epheseus fully put down, all the Eutychians would join the church. He stated their objection to receiving the Council of Chalcedon to be, that in this council Nestorianism was tolerated, and that upon this sole ground they rejected the council—that this Nestorian doctrine was held by Theodore of Mopsuestia, who was treated by the council as orthodox, though it was from him Nestorius learned the errors, and that it received as orthodox the letter of Ibas of Edessa to Maris the Persian, which was full of Nestorianism; and that if those errors and their abettors were

condemned by an edict, as well as the errors of Theodoret of Cyrus, in opposition to St. Cyril, the Acephalists would subscribe willingly to the edict.

Justinian wanted but an opportunity to commence new work; and now that it was afforded, he began. The party knew that if the edict were once published, Justinian, whose pride was excessive, would never retract it. They calculated thus to bring discredit upon the Council of Chalcedon, and, by the power of the emperor, force the Catholics to subscribe contradictions, or submit to persecution; but they were disappointed. Justinian published his edict condemning the three chapters—such was the appellation of those writings in 546—but it contained only the assertion of true doctrine.

SECTION V

The edict of Justinian on the affair of the three chapters caused great disunion in the church. The Eutychians boasted that the Council of Chalcedon was partially condemned thereby, many of the Catholics were of the same opinion, and several others could see in the edict only the declaration of the Catholic faith, without any reproach flung upon the fathers of Chalcedon.

This is not the place for us to examine the grounds of their opinions. We only mention the facts historically. A schism between the Catholics was the consequence. Pope Vigilius, who was at Constantinople, issued a condemnation of those documents styled a *judicatum*, saving, however, all respect for the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. Vigilius also placed the Empress Theodora under excommunication, and broke off special communication with Mennas.

The *judicatum*, so far from healing the schism, increased it. Vigilius then proposed to assemble a council for the examination of the chapters; and, pressed on all sides, superceded the *judicatum*, by another decree called the *constitutum*, in which, under a different formula, the same errors were condemned, and a prohibition was issued to derogate from the authority of the fathers, who had preceded those times. The Emperor and his officers ill treated the Pope in such a manner, as frequently to endanger his life; he was imprisoned to force him to acts against his conscience; and kept in a state of durance, which left his acts void of that authority to which those of a free agent only are entitled.

Meantime, in the year 553, there was an assembly of bishops held, at which very few of the westerns attended. The council was opened

in the private apartments of the cathedral of Constantinople; and after the bishops had proceeded for some time in their deliberations, the Pope had the *constitutum* sent to them, and protested against the irregularity of the proceedings; however, the sessions continued, and the errors of the three chapters were condemned; and in the last session the prelates recognised, received, and confirmed the acts of the councils of Nice, Constantinople, and Chalcedon, and declared their faith to be the same as that which was defined in those four councils, and excommunicated those who would not receive all their decisions. Eutychius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Apollinaris, of Alexandria, and the bishops, signed the acts of the council.

The Emperor still detained Vigilius in the imperial city; but having succeeded in forcing him to confirm the acts of this council in about six months, he gave him leave to return into Italy. Still the troubles caused by the tyrannical interference of Justinian, were not appeased. And although in the several documents which came from Vigilius, and the acts of the synod, there was nothing but the true doctrine of the church, the irregularity of the proceedings threw the whole transaction into discredit, and the misconstructions of the sectaries rendered doubtful the exact doctrines which were held. The council was therefore by no means generally received. Vigilius died in Sicily, on his return to Rome.

Justinian either built or repaired in Constantinople, at his own cost, thirty-one churches, amongst which, was the great church of St. Sophia, which is at this day a splendid mosque. He also, in other parts of the empire, built thirty churches, ten hospitals, and twenty-three monasteries; but he made an inglorious peace with Chosroes, the king of Persia, preferring to embroil himself and his empire in theological disquisitions, to discharging his duty by protecting his people from the ravages of enemies, and securing peace and justice for them in their temporal concerns, which had been specially entrusted to his care. This Emperor, in his latter years, fell into the heresy of the Incorruptibles, and after having been a persecutor for doctrine, a torment to the church, a defender of faith, and a violator of discipline, he died out of the pale of that church, in the year 566, having latterly begun to persecute those who held the Catholic faith, for not having followed him in his errors; amongst who was Eutychius, the patriarch of the imperial city.

His successor was Justin II., who held the Catholic faith, and recalled all the Catholic prelates who had been banished by his uncle, with the exception of Eutychius. But though his doctrine was ortho-

dox, his morality was corrupt. He died in 578, and was succeeded by Tiberius Constantine, who recalled the patriarch from Pontus, where he had spent twelve years in exile. St. Gregory the Great, who was afterwards Pope, was at this time nuncio from Pope Pelagius II., in the imperial city, [and] was on the most intimate terms with the Emperor and his successor. By the exertions of the prelates, who were now free to use their best exertions, heresy and schism disappeared in several parts. The patriarch taught, that at the resurrection the bodies would be impalpable; but upon a conversation with the nuncio, he was convinced of his error, and openly corrected it.

After a reign of four years, Tiberius died, and was succeeded by Maurice, in 582. Gregory was soon afterwards recalled to Rome, and in 590 succeeded Pelagius in the pontificate. At the close of this century, "John the Faster," a man of extraordinady austerity of life, but also of stern manners, was in the see of Constantinople; he went in his progress a step farther than any of his predecessors, and took the title of "Universal Bishop." Gregory wrote to reprove him for the presumption, requiring him to desist from using so equivocal a phrase, which had never been used by any bishop. Gregory, who knew well the history of Constantinopolitan aggressions, and the ambition of the emperors to elevate the authority of that see, as well as the flattery of the provincial prelates, justly thought it would be giving his sanction to a principle of usurpation, to permit this to pass unnoticed. John answered that he did not assume the title as claiming jurisdiction over all the churches, but over a great many. Gregory, however, insisted upon the title being altogether disused, which John for a time complied with.

The Emperor Maurice was extremely avaricious. This unfortunate passion, caused him to refuse the payment of a small ransom demanded by the Khan of the Avari, for the release of ten thousand prisoners whom he had taken. This barbarian put them to death, and Maurice, looking upon himself as their murderer, was overwhelmed with grief. However, untaught by this, he ordered his troops into winter quarters beyond the Danube, that he might support them at less expense in an enemy's country. After the massacre of the prisoners, the Emperor frequently prayed that God might rather punish him in this life, than in the next. His prayer appears to have been heard and granted.

The troops beyond the Danube, displeased at their hard treatment, revolted, and chose Phocas, exarch of the centurions, as their leader, crossed the Danube, and came to Constantinople, where they proclaimed Phocas emperor. Maurice fled from the city. Many persons stating

that Phocas could not reign whilst Maurice lived, a party was sent after the unfortunate fugitive, who was taken with his wife and eight children, and in the vicinity of Chalcedon they were deliberately murdered before his face, the unhappy father exclaiming frequently that verse of the 118th *Psalm*, "Thou art just, O Lord, and thy judgments are equitable;" the unhappy monarch himself was slain last; and Phocas thus was elevated upon a blood-stained throne. He was crowned by Cyriacus, the patriarch, who still assumed the title of "Universal Bishop."

St. Gregory the Great, died in 604, and was succeeded by Sabinianus, whose successor was Boniface III., who, during his short pontificate, procured an order from Phocas to the bishops of the imperial city, forbidding them to use the obnoxious title which John the Faster had attempted to establish, and Cyriacus had assumed.

Phocas was deposed and put to death by Heraclius, in 610, during the occupation of the see of Constantinople by Sergius. In the year 625, Chosroes, the king of Persia, who still ravaged Judea and the eastern provinces, required as a condition for peace, which Heraclius sought, the apostacy of the empire from Christianity, and the adoption of the religion of the Persians. Heraclius rejected the proposal, and prepared for vigorous operations; and it is fit here to remark, that it was upon this occasion the Turks, who were a savage tribe in the north-west of Asia, were brought down by Heraclius into Thrace; and about this period also, Mahomet began his progress in Arabia.

SECTION VI

In our last four publications we have made considerable progress in exhibiting the revolutions of religion in this unfortunate country; but the events thicken as we proceed; and as our object at present is not to give a detailed history of religion, but a sufficient sketch to enable our readers generally to know the manner in which each portion of the church came to its present situation, we shall not find it necessary to dwell so much in detail upon the subsequent history of Turkey or Greece. In our acount of Russia, in our tenth number, we showed how the faith was introduced to the southern part of that nation: and as the northern part of what is at present Turkey in Europe, and the southern part of Russia were then occupied by the same hordes, the history of one is the history of the other. We shall still, therefore, confine ourselves to the history of Thrace and Greece.

Heraclius, having determined upon carrying on the war vigorous-

ly against Chosroes, the King of Persia, was not much occupied with theology at first. However, the various sectaries which now arose produced perpetual contention and theological disputes, and the speculative Greeks were ever and ever making new distinctions, and inventing new subtleties. The original errors having been with respect to the nature of our blessed Redeemer, every particle, if we may use the expression of that nature, was subjected to their examination. A new contest now arose.

Sergius, the Archbishop of Constantinople, was a disguised Eutychian and anxious covertly to introduce his doctrines, he began with Heraclius. His imperial pupil, charmed with the care of his new preceptor, and gratified at the compliments paid to his progress in theological erudition, adopted the dictates of the archbishop as the results of his own conviction. Nor was Heraclius the only pupil of the plotting prelate. Many others were infected with the new opinions, which as yet had not been brought to full light.

Eutychianism consisted in the doctrine of the singleness of the Redeemer's nature. This doctrine had been condemned. Of course, to teach it openly would insure condemnation. But if there was only a single will, there was of course in the Redeemer only a single rational nature. Could the doctrine of this μονον θελεμα or single will be covertly established, the singleness of nature would be thus taught. This first doctrine had not yet been examined nor formally proscribed, and Sergius inculcated that in Christ there was but one will, and thus he prepared the way for the introduction of Eutychianism.

Athanasius, Patriarch of the Jacobites, who were a great body of Eutychians, having been informed by Sergius of the dispositions of Heraclius, went to meet his majesty at Hierapolis, and informed him that he and his people were anxious for a reunion with the church, and that he would make such a profession of faith as would satisfy the Patriarch of Constantinople; and offered to content himself with the expression that in Christ there was only one will. Heraclius, anxious for this union, embraced the proposition joyfully, and declared that he would take every step in his power to have Athanasius raised to the see of Antioch.

Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, was another of the conspirators who, under the pretext of union, peace, and charity, came to offer his services for the harmony of the faithful; and it was contrived that he obtained the see of Alexandria. Thus, without any noise, the principal sees of the East were, through the cunning of Sergius, in the power of Monothelites. Sophronius, a Syrian monk, was the first who exposed

the heresy: he besought the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople in vain. They drew up a form to be subscribed by all who desired union with the church. It consisted of nine articles; and the seventh only, which contained the doctrine of Monotheletism, was erroneous. The Eutychians ran in crowds to sign it, and the emperor was gratified.

The next step was to guard against the condemnation of Rome. For this purpose Sergius wrote to Pope Honorius, that a most brilliant prospect was now before them, of reuniting to the church all the contending sects of the East; that the patriarchs of Alexandria had been eminently successful; that crowds were every day flocking in to reunite themselves; and that no obstacle was raised but by the unauthorized interference of the monk Sophronius, who was creating difficulties by discussing a new question upon which the Scriptures contained nothing, and which the councils had never even entertained, and which, though many of the fathers had touched upon, still was more a question for grammarians than for bishops; and that, as all the success of their exertions depended upon peace, it was requested that Honorius would command silence upon this new topic. The artifice succeeded; and the Pope, thus deceived, wrote a letter desiring that there should be no dispute about words, and that Sophronius should not trouble the patriarch of Alexandria. Sophronius was meantime raised to the see of Jerusalem, and held a council, in which Monotheletism was condemned. He wrote to Honorius, and in return the Pope sent a second letter, in which he repeated his desire of silence upon the subject. Sophronius, aware that there must have been some imposition practised upon the Holy See, selected Stephen, Bishop of Doria, upon whom he placed the greatest reliance, and taking him to Mount Calvary, bound him solemnly, as he would account to that Saviour who there shed his blood, to go to Rome, and to lay the facts distinctly before the Pope, and gave him upwards of six hundred passages of the fathers, which clearly contained the doctrines of two wills, the human and the divine, together with scriptural texts. The Monothelites did all they could to intercept the holy bishop; but though they waylaid him in a variety of places, he arrived safely in Rome, but found Honorius had died.

Meantime Sergius composed a document, which Heraclius published under the title of *Ecthesis*, or an explanation, in 639. The doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation are clearly stated in Catholic terms in this document; but there is a passage regarding the unity of will in the Redeemer, which is susceptible of an explanation in either sense. This document caused great commotion. Severinus was the immediate

successor of Honorius; but dying after a pontificate of four months, he was succeeded by John IV., who, learning the true state of the question from the Bishop of Doria, condemned the Ecthesis in 640. Heraclius thereupon revoked the document, and informed the Pope that it had been drawn up by Sergius.

Jerusalem was taken by the Mussulmen, under the Caliph Omar, in 638; and in the following year, on the 11th of March, 638, St. Sophronius died. The Emperor Heraclius was succeeded in 641 by Constantine, who, after a reign of [more] than three months, made way for Heracleonas, and he in six months was succeeded by the Emperor Constans, in the same year 641.

Sergius, Bishop of Constantinople, died in 638, and was succeeded by Pyrrhus, a Monothelite. This prelate, having joined with Martina and Herecleonas in their wicked poisoning of Constantine, and the usurpation of Heracleonas, fled from the city after the punishment of the empress and the usurper. Paul, another Monothelite, occupied the see of Constantinople; and he prevailed upon Constans, the emperor, in 648, to publish his edict called the Type, imposing silence on the Catholics and the Monothelites. The Type was condemned by Pope Theodore in the same year. Pyrrhus, having passed from Africa to Rome, retracted his errors, and was received into communion with the Pope: thence he passed to Ravenna, where, at the instigation of the exarch Olympius, he relapsed into his errors, in the expectation of being restored to the favour of the emperor; and Paul dying in 655, he again got into the see of the imperial city. Many of the best and bravest, and wisest men of the empire fell victims to the relentless persecution of the Monothelites: amongst them was the holy Pope Martin, who, after severe torture in Constantinople, died of want and ill-treatment, in exile in Chersonesus.

Constans dying in 668, was succeeded by his son, Constantine Pogonatus, who was a Catholic. He requested of Pope Donus to assemble a council; but that pontiff, in 688, was succeeded by Agatho, who complied with the emperor's request, and sent his legate to preside at the synod, which assembled in Constantinople in the month of November, 680. Theodore, Monothelite, had succeeded Pyrrhus in the see of that city; and he having been deposed, his place was filled by George, a Catholic. In this council the Monothelite heresy was condemned, as were its abettors; and amongst them, Honorius the Pope had his memory censured for his criminal silence and neglect of opposing the progress of heresy. Pope Agatho dying in Rome before the acts of the council reached him, its canons were confirmed by his successor, Leo II. This is the third Council of Constantinople, and the sixth general council.

THE GREEK SCHISM

SECTION I

We fear exceedingly that a pure republican form of government cannot be established by this valorous people; the miscalled Holy Alliance cannot bear a free government to exist within the sphere of its action. We fear that the only hope of patriotic and brave Greece must rest on the position advanced by some of her agents—even to receive a king from some reigning house in Europe. This seems to be the alternative between two evils: to choose Egyptian bondage, or European monarchy, and we can harldy blame this suffering people for preferring the latter as the less of the two evils. The friend of Greece and of humanity must shed a tear of sympathy over the uncertain and dangerous condition in which Greece now stands, according to the latest and best authenticated accounts from Europe.

Having gone thus far into the civil concerns of Greece, let us see a little of the religious history of this people. For the first eight centuries of Christianity, the Greek or Eastern Church was in full communion with the Western or Latin Church, and under the jurisdiction and supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, and visible head of the Church of Christ on earth. During this period several errors were broached in the East. Much of the Platonic and pagan, or philosophy on abstract principles, existed among the Greek Christians, and by endeavouring to incorporate or reconcile these principles with the principles of the Gospel, several errors in religion were introduced. In order to correct these errors and to establish the true principles of the Gospel, general councils of the church were from time to time convened: and so we perceive that the first eight general councils were held in the East.

The first was held at Nice, in 325, regarding the divinity of Christ, and condemning Arian heresy. The second at Constantinople, in 381, regarding the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and condemning the heresy of the Semi-Arians, the Sabellians and Macedonians. The third at Ephesus, in 431, against the Nestorians, showing that there was only one person in Christ, and that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of

God, or Θεοτοκος. The fourth at Chalcedon, in 451, against the Eutychians, showing that there were two natures in Christ. The fifth at Constantinople, in 553, respecting the errors of Origen and the Three Chapters. The sixth at Constantinople, in 680, against the Monothelites, proving that there were two wills and operations in Christ. The seventh at Nice, in 787, condemning the Iconoclasts, (image-breakers,) establishing the doctrine of proper respect to sacred images. The eighth at Constantinople, in 869, against the schism of Photius. This proud and intruded prelate gave origin to the unfortunate separation of the Greek from the Catholic Church. Until this period both churches were under one head, and though the Eastern Church lost many members by the above-named heresies, the great body were still Catholic, and in full communion with the Catholic Apostolic Church of Rome. One fact is very striking; that though the several separatists of the Eastern Church differ from the Catholic Church, yet they agree with her in all those points on which Protestants differ from the Catholic doctrine.

The history of Photius, the remarkable schismatic, must be examined.—Bardas, the uncle of the young Emperor Michael, who then governed the Eastern Empire, gave great scandal by his profligate mode of living. Ignatius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and son of the Emperor Michael le Begue, predecessor of Leo the Armenian, felt it his duty to tell this profligate prince how injurious his example was to Christianity. He requested of him to look at least to his own soul; but this good advice only inflamed the passion of this royal delinquent. This public sinner presented himself to partake of the Holy Eucharist on the festival of Pentecost—the patriarch refused him the Holy Communion. Bardas vowed vengeance, and formed a determination to ruin him in the eyes of the emperor. In three days after, a deputation was sent to Ignatius, requiring of him to resign his see. He resisted all promises and threats. The emperor, disregarding the canons of the church, appointed Photius patriarch. This wicked man possessed great accomplishments of mind and body, but his unbounded ambition and finished hypocrisy tarnished the whole. Having considerable property, he possessed the means of making many supporters; by his assiduous application to literature he acquired a great reputation; in ecclesiastical learning he made considerable proficiency. Having secured the patronage of Bardas, he paved the way to his nomination to the patriarchate. He was then a layman; but he contrived to get himself through the several orders to episcopacy, in six days! At his consecration he promised to hold communion with Ignatius, and in less than two months he declared vengeance against him and all in his com-

munion. Ignatius is hurried from prison to prison, and most cruelly treated. Every means is employed to force from him a resignation of his see. But Photius, impatient of delay, assembles a sham council, with the support of the emperor, and declares Ignatius deposed. He also procures the deposition of all the bishops who remain firm to Ignatius; they are cast into prison, and Ignatius is exiled to the Isle of Lesbos. In the mean time Photius sends a delegation to Rome to have his own title confirmed, and the deposition of Ignatius ratified, on the pretence that Ignatius, through infirmity, was no longer able to discharge the duties of his office. Pope Nicholas was on his guard—he sends two legates to Constantinople to get a correct statement of the case. The legates are not permitted to inquire into the facts, and are told that if they do not report favourably for Photius that they will be sent into cruel exile. After long resistance they yield to the emperor's will. Ignatius is removed to the Isle of Terebintius, where he suffers much; he is thence called to assist at a council formed in order to forward the views of Photius. Ignatius intending to assist in his patriarchial robes, is commanded by the emperor to come in the garb of a simple monk—he obeys, and comes to the council, where the emperor attends; he is pressed to give in his resignation, and not yielding, he is sent away: in ten days after he is forced to return, for he declared his intention not to be present at such a council, which was held in violation of all the rules of the church. False charges are made against Ignatius; it is said that he was consecrated without an electoral decree; a sentence of deposition is pronounced against him; he is divested of the pallium and of his episcopal robes, and is declared unworthy of priesthood. Photius causes him to be shut up in the vault of Constantine Copronymus; he is given in charge to three cruel guards, who strip him of his clothes and place him on a cold flag during the rigours of the winter season; he is left for eight days without food or repose; he is put into a marble tomb, and bound therein, and is left a whole night in this cruel posture; he is unbound the next day, and his hand is forcibly put to sign a deed, drawn up by Photius, to the following purport: "I, Ignatius, the unworthy Patriarch of Constantinople, declare that I have been raised to this see without an electoral decree, and that I have tyrannically governed the same." This pretended declaration is presented to the emperor, and Ignatius is set at liberty. This illustrious prelate then sends to Rome a memorial signed by the metropolitans, fifty bishops, and many priests; he relates what he suffered, and prays for redress.

Photius, not yet satisfied, advises the emperor to make Ignatius

read aloud in the Church of the Apostles, at Constantinople, his act of resignation, and to cause his hand to be cut off, and his eyes plucked out. Ignatius, being informed of the whole, escapes this new persecution by flight. In the garb of a slave he retreats by night from the city, and flies to the Isle of Propontide: he suffers much in his flight, and is closely sought for by Photius.

In the mean time Photius writes hypocrital letters to Pope Nicholas, and says, "When I reflect on the great duties of the episcopal station, and on the weakness of man, and on my own particular, I am surprised that any one could be found to assume such serious obligations. I cannot express my regret on beholding myself invested with such a burden. My predecessor having resigned his see, the clergy, the metropolitans, and especially the emperor, full of kindness towards others, but of cruelty towards me, and regardless of my opposition, have laid the episcopal charge on my shoulders. Thus in spite of my tears and regrets they have forced me into the episcopacy." Conscious of his own imposture, he exhibited forged letters from the Pope, which he himself had penned. The forgery was discovered, but he contrived to evade the deserved punishment. Photius was equally criminal in concealing the scandals of the Emperor Michael. This profligate prince laughed at all ceremonies and doctrines of Christianity.

Pope Nicholas being duly informed of what passed at Constantinople, holds a council, and condemns Photius as a usurper. He writes to Constantinople, saying that he will never hold communion with Photius, unless he renounces his usurped see.

Cæsar Bardas meets a fatal end, and Photius loses his chief supporter. Michael, suspecting Bardas, gets him torn in pieces. Photius, yielding to the times, strongly inveighs against Bardas, and endeavours to merit the good graces of Michael. Many having retired from the communion of Photius, on receiving the papal mandate, he excites a violent persecution against them. He deprives some of their dignities—others of their property, and sends others into exile. On seeing that the Pope cut him off from his communion, he excommunicates the Pope in turn. . . . To give a colouring to his proceedings, he holds what he called a general council, where the emperor presides, and some legates from the East. False charges and false witnesses are produced against Pope Nicholas. Photius pretends to take the part of the Pope, and says he ought not to be condemned in his absence. The members of the council oppose his feigned opposition, and a sentence of deposition is pronounced against the Pope. He sends the acts

of the council to the Roman emperor for Lewis, and begs of him to banish Pope Nicholas, as being condemned by a general council.

This proceeding, of course, broke off all communion between the See of Rome and Photius; but to support his usurpation, Photius writes a circular to the Eastern bishops, accusing the Latin Church of errors. Behold the prototype of Martin Luther. The accusation was, that the Roman Church held that the Holy Ghost "proceeded not only from the Father, but from the Son." To the present day this is the chief point on doctrinal matters between the Greek schismatics and the Catholic Church.

Pope Nicholas, being informed of this charge, writes a pastoral letter on the unjust proceedings of the Greek emperor, and refutes the calumnies advanced against the Church of Rome.

The Emperor Michael still proceeds in his iniquitous career. Wishing to assassinate Basilius in a chase, he is himself killed by his own guards in a state of intoxication, and Basilius is proclaimed emperor. On the next day Photius is banished, and Ignatius is recalled from his exile. Basilius, with the advice of Ignatius, writes to Pope Adrian to assemble a general council, in order to heal the wounds inflicted on the church by the schism of Photius. The Pope sends three legates to Constantinople, where they are received with every mark of respect. The emperor pays them due honours and requests of them to exert all their influence to establish a reunion of both churches.

SECTION II

Pope Adrian, having duly convened a general council to restore peace to the Greek Church, the council was accordingly opened on the 5th of October, 869, in the Church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople. The Pope's legates, to whom was assigned the first place, presented their credentials to the Emperor Basilius or Basil, by whom they are received with marks of profound respect; the Patriarch Ignatius took his seat next to the Pope's legates, then the legates from the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. The bishops who suffered persecution from Photius were then introduced. At the close of the first session, the Pope's letter was read to the council. In the next session, those priests and bishops, who yielded to the violence of persuasion of Photius, presented themselves, and explained the rigorous treatment employed by Photius in order to bring them over to his usurpation. They said they were chained, cast into hideous dungeons, and supplied with the most offensive food; they, however, expressed their sorrow for having fallen.

By order of the legates, Photius attends at the fifth session; on his appearance, they exclaim, "is this Photius who has caused so much trouble in the Church?" Photius affects a profound silence, quotes some text from Scripture, false in their application, and offensive to the council; he persists in his silence—he is required to yield to the voice of the council—he answers by reciting more texts of Scripture, which did not bear on the question, and which only exposed his hypocrisy.

The Emperor attends at the sixth session; the bishops favourable to Photius are present, and on being convinced of their error, the greater part renounce the schism. Photius is again exhorted in the seventh to submit. He replies that he has no answer to make to calumny. In the eighth session, the imposition and foul means practised by Photius, in order to create and continue the schism, are investigated and fully detected. Many of the image-breakers abjure their error. In the ninth session, penance is imposed on the false witnesses who were procured against Ignatius. When the partizans and accomplices in crime of the Emperor Michael, are arraigned for their wicked proceedings, they advance as an excuse the threats and menances of that prince.

At the tenth and last session, the emperor, with his son, Constantine, attends; the three ambassadors from Lewis, Emperor of Italy and France, and those from Michael, King of Bulgaria, are present, and about one hundred bishops. They approve of the seven general councils —confirm the sentence of Pope Nicholas and Adrian against Photius. Twenty-seven canons of discipline are drawn up, and a confession of faith against the errors of the "Monothelites and Iconoclasts."

The pride of Photius would not submit; for the space of eight years, which he passed in exile, he is devising means for his restoration. He endeavours, by a singular stratagem, to secure the favor of the emperor Basil. He frames a genealogy, in which he flatters the pride of the prince by tracing his origin to Tiridades, King of Armenia, and enriches this genealogy with a prophecy "that the reign of Basil would be more illustrious than any of his predecessors." Photius transcribes this fictitious narrative on three old parchments, and envelopes them in a moth-eaten cover, and thus couched sends them to Theophanes, the emperor's secretary, with whom he had previously compounded on the subject.

Theophanes shows this roll to the emperor as being the oldest and most curious manuscript in the library, and says that nobody is able to read or explain it but Photius. Basil, ignorant of the deception, yields to the impulse of vanity, recalls Photius, receives him kindly, and gives him free access to his presence.

Ignatius falls dangerously ill in the 80th year of his age. On the 24th of October, while the divine office was reciting at midnight, Ignatius inquires whose feast the church celebrated on the next day—he is told that of St. James, called the brother of our Lord—he answered, that is my "patron" saint, and having given his benediction to his clergy, he slept in the Lord. The Greek and Latin Churches honour his memory on the day of his death.

Photius, finding Ignatius, the great obstacle to his ambitious views, no more, he assumes once more the patriarchal chair, and persecutes the friends and adherents of Ignatius, and all in his communion. He gains over some by promises, others by threats, and those who remain faithful, he puts to death. He gains over the two legates sent by Pope John to Constantinople, regarding some ecclesiastical matters in Bulgaria. He sends delegates to Rome with insidious letters, in order to have himself recognised the legitimate patriarch of Constantinople. He convenes a council, which he endeavours to render as numerous and as respectable as he could. He contrives to make it appear that the Pope recognises him as a brother patriarch. He is then extolled as a prodigy of learning, moderation, and piety; he induces the Roman legates to declare him as legitimate patriarch, and to condemn the proceedings of the eighth general council. The Emperor Basil assists at the sixth session of this sham council, where they rescind that article of the general council of Constantinople, which decreed that "the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son."

Yet iniquity cannot prevail; Pope John being informed that Photius did not demand pardon for his past transgressions, and that he endeavoured to revert the sentence declared against him by a general council, he, the Pope, rejects him and his false council. The succeeding Pontiffs, Martin, Adrian III., and Stephen V., equally condemn the proceedings of Photius.

The Emperor Basil died in 886, and is succeeded by Leo VI., surnamed the Philosopher, who was fully aware of the iniquitous and schismatical acts of Photius—this great schismatic is exiled to the monastery of the Armenians, where he soon finished his evil career. Peace and unity are restored to the Greek Church.

We have endeavoured to compress these facts into as narrow limits as possible, in order not to weary some of our readers, who appear to have a great aversion to lengthened discussions. Unfortunately we have no good ecclesiastical history in the English language. The histories in Latin and French are rather voluminous, and hence it is no easy matter to collect a good account of church concerns in a few pages;

it would be much easier to give copious extracts than succinct narratives on such matters, but our time and labour are for the public and so we shall spare no pains to satisfy them.

SECTION III

In the death of Photius the schismatics lost their head and chief support: the great portion of the people returned to Catholic ministry and truth. The letters and works of Photius being in considerable circulation kept alive the spirit of disobedience to the mother church. Though the materials for fresh schism were for a considerable time ready to burst forth into open insubordination, yet it was not till the year 1050 that the brand of discord was violently hurled into the bosom of the church by Michael Cerullarius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and a bold proselyte to the views of Photius. Many of the Greek bishops were anxious for some occasion of renewing the schism, and of finding some resolute champion in their cause. The Patriarch of Constantinople had lately assumed the title of "Universal Bishop," knowing well, that such a step would not pass unnoticed by the Pope. Italy was at this period in a divided condition, and the seat of war and desolation, and from the intrigue and influence of some corrupt chieftains and princes, some unworthy men were raised to the papal chair, which they dishonoured by their irregular lives, and which brought scandal on the church, and sunk the papal authority in the esteem of the Greek church.

During this state of affairs, Michael Cerullarius writes a letter to one of the Latin bishops, which at once revives and propagates the old schism. He attempts to prove to all the Latin bishops, that Christ, after having celebrated the ancient "Pasch" in "Azymes" or unleavened bread, instituted the pasch or eucharist sacrifice of the new law, in leavened bread, and hence Cerullarius charges the Latin Church with error; he also accuses the "Latins" for shaving their beards, for fasting on Saturday—for eating strangled meat, and for inserting the word "*filioque*," "from the Son," in the Nicene Creed, and thereby expressing their belief of the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and from the Son. He brings other charges equally false and frivolous against the church, in that the kiss of peace is given at mass before the communion, that "alleluiah" is not sung in Lent, and that due respect was not paid to the memory and relics of the saints: he concludes by saying that as soon as the Latin church will correct these errors, that he will send other important communications; this at once put the schism beyond the hope of a reconciliation.

Cardinal Humbert, having read this letter, translates it into Latin, and sends a copy of it to Pope Leo IX. The Pope replies in a long letter, wherein he first complains of the conduct of those who were endeavouring to disturb the peace of the Church; he then adds, "Is the Church of Rome, after the lapse of more than one thousand years since the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, now to begin to learn how to celebrate the 'institution' of the last supper? Are the instructions of the apostles Peter and Paul, then of no use?" The conclusion of this letter is worthy of the common father [and of] Rome. "Let the Greeks follow the traditions of their fathers. We know that the difference of customs, according to times and nations, is not injurious to salvation, provided we be united in faith and charity."

In the meantime the Emperor Constantine Monourachus, wishing, through political motives, to keep in with the Pope, wrote him a letter in which he expressed his anxiety to support the union of both churches, and he induced Cerullarius to write to the same effect. On receiving these letters, Leo replied, and sent three legates, of whom Cardinal Humbert was the chief. In the letter to Cerullarius the Pope styles him merely Bishop of Constantinople, which was not conducive to reconcile one to the Catholic Church, who seemed so desirous of schism. The legates were respectfully received by the emperor, and Cardinal Humbert replies to the letter of Cerullarius, in which he fully vindicates the Roman Catholic Church from the charges of Cerullarius. He shows that Jesus Christ celebrated the eucharist in unleavened bread, and supported with the great body of commentators that Christ celebrated the legal "Pasch," which could not be celebrated with any other but unleavened bread.

This answer made no impression on Cerullarius; he refused to see or communicate with the legates.

They indignantly expressed their displeasure at his conduct: perhaps they went too far. They went to the Church of St. Sophia and laid on the altar a sentence of excommunication against Cerullarius in presence of his clergy and flock; they then retired, and shook the dust from off their feet, exclaiming, "May God behold him and judge him." The form of excommunication ended with these words, "By the authority of the blessed Trinity, of the apostolic see, of the seven general councils of the Catholic Church, we subscribe to the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the Pope, and say, let Michael Cerullarius, the pretended patriarch, guilty of many crimes, and Leo, the Bishop of Arcadia, and all their followers, be separated from the church, until they be converted and do penance. *Amen, Amen, Amen.*" They also

forbid the laity of Constantinople to receive the holy communion from any clergyman who attributed errors to the Latin Church. Finally, they received their passport from the emperor, and [some] presents for the Pope. Such a proceeding increased the schism instead of subduing it. Cerullarius, highly incensed at this act, issued a counter decree: this decree bore his name and those of fourteen metropolitans, and declared that these legates, in attempting to corrupt the holy doctrine, were condemned by the emperor.

The Greeks after this could not bear the idea of a reconciliation with the Latin Church. They mutually encouraged each other to support the schism. They supposed that the hasty proceedings of the legates fully justified them, and erroneously attributed the faults of three individuals to the whole body of the Catholic Church. This is a common way of acting with all separatists. The schism then considerably extended its pestilential influence. Cities and provinces were soon involved in the vortex, and it came at last to such a pitch, that the Greeks looked with more indignation on the members of the Latin Church, than they did on the very pagans. Such are the evil effects of passion, disappointment, and the violation of Christian unity. We see to the present day the same melancholy effects produced by similar feelings. Would to God! that we all had but "one heart and one spirit," like the primitive Christians.—May the God of peace and charity infuse into us, his Holy Spirit of unity.

PART IV

ESSAYS

THE REPUBLIC IN DANGER

[This series of letters was occasioned, as the short note accompanying the extract from the *Southern Religious Telegraph*, which is prefixed to it, shows, by the denunciations made against Catholics, in this and similar publications, as the enemies of civil freedom. It contains a brief history of the origin, progress, and commencing decline of the systematic effort to crush the rights and liberties of the Catholic communion, by classing its members with criminals against the state; an analysis of the theory of the Federal Government of the United States, in its relation to moral and religious questions, in which the essential difference between it and the European polity of the middle ages is pointed out; a defence of the Catholics of the United States against the accusation of hostility to its civil institutions; and a delineation of the course of policy which the party calling itself "Evangelical," would seek to carry out, by means of a "Christian party in politics." The letters were first published in the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for 1831, and afterwards republished in a pamphlet.]

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 11th, 1831.

To the Editors of the United States Catholic Miscellany.

Gentlemen:—I send you herewith the *Southern Religious Telegraph*, to which you requested my attention. I have carefully perused the article entitled, "The Republic in Danger!" and pray you to give it insertion in your next publication.

I shall, God willing, send you a few letters which will express my sentiments, not only upon this very unbecoming production, but upon other topics connected with the party from which it emanates, and regarding the spirit by which that party is animated and urged on. I shall, I trust, be able to send you my first communication by the close of this week, or early in the next.

I have the honour to remain, gentlemen,

Very sincerely yours, and so forth,

B. C.

Keep thou the napkin, and go boast of this;
And, if thou tell'st the heavy story right,
Upon my soul, the hearers will shed tears:
Yea, even my foes will shed fast falling tears,
And say, Alas, it was a piteous deed!

Henry VI. Pt. III.

THE REPUBLIC IN DANGER!

RICHMOND, VA., July 1, 1831.

At this season, while thousands of our fellow-citizens are preparing to celebrate, in some way or other, the memorable day which dates the existence of our country as an independent nation, it ought not to be concealed that the republic is in danger. It may be imagined, and many, no doubt, do imagine that all is well: that increasing numbers and growing prosperity are evidences of the safety of the republic, and pledges of its perpetuity; but this dream of the imagination, so fondly entertained, instead of diminishing, increases the danger to which it is exposed. Whatever good citizens may imagine, there is danger; the republic is invaded by enemies that are plotting its destruction, more numerous and more powerful than the hostile armies of '76; and, what renders its condition the more hazardous, is the fact that the assaults of the enemy are so insidious, that they are not generally observed by the people. Let good citizens look around them—we would give no false alarm—let them look at the encampment of the enemy, and see the hostile powers arrayed against the republic, and they will be convinced that the present is not the time to dream that all is safe.

Intemperance has invaded the whole land; it has been cutting down 30,000 citizens annually, for the last ten years! Had a foreign power made all this devastation, the cry of, "To arms!" "to arms!" would have been reiterated in every part of the republic; the whole people would have risen, *en masse*, to drive out the invader; but, even now, after hundreds of thousands have been immolated as victims of destruction, after the alarm has been sounded in every part of the land, only 300,000, of 12,000,000, have enlisted in the ranks of those who have solemnly resolved to drive out the enemy. While the land has been stained with the blood of his victims, many of our political watchmen who ought to see that the republic receives no detriment, have been so intent on elections, that they have not appeared to know of this invasion.

The same enemy has plundered our citizens of millions of dollars annually. Had one half of this sum been contributed for the education of men to give sound religious instruction to the thousands of the uninstructed and prejudiced in this country, or to send the blessings of Christianity to the deluded heathen, some of our political seers would have raised the cry of "enthusiasm!" "These bigoted fanatics will drain the people of their money, and ruin the country!" But there is no bigotry, no fanaticism, it seems, in drunkenness. There is no danger when the guardians of the republic sleep, while millions are plundered

from the people, to prepare an offering of human blood for this insatiable Moloch.

Popery has invaded the land, and is laying the foundations of an empire, with which, if it prevail, the enlightened freedom of the republic cannot coexist. Let no one be surprised that Popery should here be noticed in connexion with intemperance: for next to the fire which burns out reason and conscience, that power is to be dreaded which stupefies conscience and blinds the understanding, and withholds the only light which can guide human reason aright, and makes the whole man a superstitious slave to the impositions of a crafty priesthood. Already, "the beast" numbers half a million of subjects in these United States; and the morality and practices of this communion accord so well with the views and feelings of thousands of the descendants of Protestants, who cannot endure the "bigoted rules" of Presbyterians, that the industrious efforts of the minions of the Pope to extend his authority in our land, are regarded with more complacency and delight, than any enterprise in which Christians have engaged to diffuse the light in influences of the Gospel. Yes; it is well known that the anti-Christian moralists of our times have more sympathy for the monster that is forging chains to bind them, than they have for any denomination of enlightened Christians in the land; and here the danger is the more imminent, because it is unseen. The tolerant friends of Popery, who seem to regard it as differing little from the religion of the Bible, or of Protestants, and the indifferent spectators, know not its influence; its power to excite the imagination, captivate the senses, and enslave the mind to forms of superstition, while no truth is brought to bear on the conscience or the heart; nor do they appear to know the fact, which is demonstrated by the whole history of Popery, that civil and religious liberty, as understood in this country the last half century, cannot coexist with the laws of the papal communion. If the latter are administered, liberty must die; from the nature of things, it is impossible for them to flourish together.

Some say that a bad man injures no one but himself; this is often said of the intemperate man: "Poor fellow! he injures no one but himself." But it is not true: a bad man injures all with whom he has influence, (and every one has influence somewhere;) he injures the community in which he lives; he injures the republic. Now, in addition to the dangers threatened and the injuries inflicted, by some hundreds of thousands of the subjects of Popery and intemperance, there are thousands of others whose example and influence, even while they plume themselves for patriots, are injuring the republic. This is true of all

profane swearers who take the name of God in vain, and thus provoke him to come out in judgment against them; and of all Sabbath-breakers, who are weakening the restraints of virtue and countenancing vice, and encouraging others to neglect the instructions and ordinances of the church of Christ, the only efficient means which has ever been known for saving a people from gross ignorance, wickedness, and superstition. This, too, is true of all gamblers, and of all the votaries of dissipation, whose example is pernicious to the community. The republic, also, receives detriment from infidels, and all the varying tribes of anti-Christians that inhabit the land. They may, perhaps, be well-meaning people; they may not intend to injure the public: but such is the nature of their principles, that they cannot avoid doing injury. They often injure much better men than themselves, who at first pity them, but at length are seduced by their flattery, or pernicious errors.

The danger to the republic, from men of this stamp, has been increased by the fact that they fill some of its important places of trust; so many of them had, by some means, obtained such stations a year or two since, that no Christian could speak plainly of the dangers to which his country was exposed, without being charged with the crime of "mingling with politics!" They seemed to regard the wise provisions of the Constitution to prevent the establishment of religion by law, as an ordinance to consign the world of politics to the dominion of infidelity. They seemed to think that they had an exclusive right to reign in the political world; hence the charge of "intermeddling with politics," when good men spoke or acted with reference to existing evils, as if they had no interest in transmitting our republican institutions unimpaired to their children; hence the outcry raised against the Rev. Dr. Ely, for sentiments which he published relative to the importance of electing men of good principles, who could be trusted, for civil rulers: sentiments which no man but an infidel need blush to avow.

We might speak of other evils which injure the public. It is well known that too many of the conductors of the political press, instead of informing the people, as watchmen ought, of the dangers which threaten the republic, are wholly engaged in promoting the supposed interests of their favourite candidates. It would not be difficult to show by facts that the evils of this course are incalculable—but we cannot now pursue this unpleasant topic. Enough, we hope, has been said of these dangers to persuade good men to pray for their country, and for all in authority. Let our country—its republican institutions, seminaries of learning, our rulers, and all the interests of the people, be remembered by Christians at the throne of grace, on the approaching Fourth of July.

Prayer will not prevent them from rejoicing on this day. Let these objects of prayer be often commended to God in earnest supplication—for if He visit this people in judgment as their national sins deserve, scenes may yet be witnessed in our country which will fill the boldest hearts with dismay.[1]

LETTER I

Cùm Proteus consueta petens è fluctibus antra
Ibat: eum vasti circum gens humida ponti
Exultans rorem latè dispergit amarum

VIRGIL, *Georg.* iv.

When weary Proteus, from the briny waves,
Retir'd for shelter to his wonted caves:
His finny flocks about their shepherd play,
And rolling round him, spirt the bitter sea.

Dryden.

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 16, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced American People.

My Friends:—It is some time since I requested your attention to an essay which appeared in the Christian Advocate, denying the fact of St. Peter having been at Rome. That periodical work was under the management of the Rev. Dr. Green, a Presbyterian minister of Philadelphia; and the appearance of the essay, together with the comments by which it was accompanied, were intended to insinuate that the claims made by the Roman Catholic church were unfounded. I have been informed by several respectable persons who differ from me in religious belief, that the evidence which I then hastily collected, was abundantly sufficient to remove every shadow of doubt, if any was entertained, that the glorious apostle was in Rome, was bishop of that city, and died there. The Rev. Dr. Green, has not, as far as I can discover, ever made any retraction, never corrected the error into which he contributed to lead his readers, nor exhibited the least symptom of regret for the part which he and his clerical brother played upon that occasion.

I have since then marked with a greater degree of attention the proceedings of the body to which this minister belongs. Not only has it continued through a number of its presses, to vilify and to misrepresent Roman Catholics, but has by some of its publications endeavoured to excite against them the suspicions and the hatred of all friends of civil and religious liberty; not only has it sought by means of associations

[1] From the *Southern Religious Telegraph.*

formed under its auspices, and directed by its influence, to secure for itself a widespread domination through the land; but it has collected vast sums of money, and prepared to organize a host of zealots to sweep from the valley of the Mississippi the religion of the survivor of that noble assembly that created the liberty which it enjoys. Not content with the possession of the vast power which it at present holds, it looks forward to the securing of a future monopoly, of a more extensive and absorbing nature, and hesitates not in the triumph of its calculations to anticipate what it considers the inevitable arrival of the millennium of its glory, when the youth that it now trains up shall with its principles, assert their bloodless victory at the ballot boxes. Yet impatient of the delay, and desirous of hastening the happy epoch, it makes unceasing efforts, at one moment to procure from Congress a fatal precedent in even one act of what it styles Christian legislation; and at another, to render Catholics more odious to their fellow-citizens, or more suspected of being dangerous to the republic. Let it succeed in either way, and a passage will have been opened, through which it may pour the stream of its power, sweeping away the obstacles that retard, widening and deepening the channel by the impetuosity of its current, until, like so many new feeders, law gradually added to law, shall have caused church after church to disappear; and if then an effort should be made to stop the torrent, if the dam itself should not be swept away, the inundation would spread over the face of the land, and overwhelm the inhabitants.

My friends, I am not the only one who has beheld this, I am but one out of millions to whom it was visible, and, though silent until now upon the subject, I have heard, and you have heard the facts proclaimed by very many, and I sumbit to you whether the assertions which I make are not sustained, amongst others, by the article entitled *The Republic in Danger*, which has been published in the *Southern Religious Telegraph*, in the city of Richmond, in Virginia, on the first day of this month, and reprinted in the *Catholic Miscellany* of last Saturday.

The body to which I thus allude, is not the Presbyterian church. There are a large number of the members of that church who have too much love of civil and religious liberty, too much affection for their fellow-citizens, and too deep a sense of common honesty to belong to the association. Nor is it confined to the Presbyterian denomination, though a number of the Presbyterian presses are the chief instruments for disseminating its principles; it embraces a vast multitude of other sects of various religious sentiments and forms of government. It is composed of the elect, the more sanctified and perfect of the land, as they

esteem themselves; who leagued together in a holy covenant, to wage a war of extermination against Infidels and Roman Catholics, are urged by as pythonic a spirit against unbelievers and "the beast," as their predecessors in Europe were against the Turk and the Pope, and frequently with the Turk against the holy father.

I consider then the production which I now undertake to review, not as a document of any one of the churches of our country, but as publishing the well-known sentiments of a large body diffused through several of the churches and spread through all the states. Whatever the other objects of this body may be, I shall not now undertake to develope; but shall confine myself at present to showing that its treatment of Roman Catholics is not only uncharitable and unjust, but is manifestly at variance with the spirit of our political institutions. How far my leisure and other circumstances may subsequently lead me, if I shall proceed beyond this boundary, I cannot now determine.

I shall give you from their own version of the Scripture, the description given by St. Paul of charity, in the thirteenth chapter of his *First Epistle to Corinthians.* "Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, and endureth all things."

Whoever reads their productions, whether they be the reports of Bible distributions, of tract supplyings, of missions abroad or at home, of temperance societies, of revivals, or Sabbath observance societies, or whatever else that belongs to the associated body, will necessarily often meet with mention of Roman Catholics, and one of the leading exhibitions is the vulgar and unkind substitution of nick-names for the appellation by which this body is and has been known throughout the world. Great Britain, it is true, took the lead in this lowest species of offensive, unkind, unseemly, insulting, and therefore uncharitable scurrility; not indeed in point of time or of virulence, but of legalized and common phraseology. Luther previously had bestowed the appellation of Antichrist upon the Pope, for the first time in 1520; designated him as the Roman homicide, and threatened "that the name of the Pope should be taken from beneath the heavens:" he called him "a wolf possessed by an evil spirit." On a subsequent occasion he declared that "the Pope was so full of devils, that he spit them, and blew them from

his nose." In his apostrophe to Pope Paul III, he uses the following:[2]

. . . .

In his subsequent writings he uses nicknames where he can, and would not vouchsafe to the adherents of the ancient church any name but that of Papists. I do not now enter upon the question of his doctrine or his mission; but I assert, that be the errors of those whom we oppose what they may, the bestowal of a nickname is an evidence of the want of common courtesy; kindness and charity are violated by the persons who continue to use the term, especially in the spirit which gave it origin. It was in the same spirit that Luther in 1534 called Henry VIII. of England, "a fool," "an idiot," "the most brutal of swine and asses." It was in the same spirit that when he came forth, in 1521, from his Patmos, as he called the place of his retreat, he declared in his sermon in the church at Wittemberg, "It was the word, whilst I slept quietly and drank my beer with my dear Melancthon and Amsdorf that gave the papacy such a shock," and that, when he threatened to re-establish the Mass, he asks his associates "What hurt will the Popish Mass do you?" It was in this spirit that he styled Rome, Babylon, the Pope, the man of sin, the beast, and so forth, and the church, the whore of Babylon, and so forth. Indeed, he left scarcely room to any succeeding imagination to extend the nick-nomenclature.

Yet, though to him is due the invention, Great Britain has the discredit of introducing this vocabulary into her public legislation, and her high authority made that fashionable, which in its origin and its essence was vulgar, unseemly, and uncharitable. The object was to express contempt, which is not only unkind but is never sought after, save by those who are envious, vaunting, or puffed up. It contains no argument, but betrays a symptom, equivocal, it is true, of its absence; for it is generally observed that he who is anxious to fasten a nick-name upon his adversary, seldom makes the effort until he has failed in adducing a reason. The works of the principal English Protestant divines will go down to other days, lamentable monuments of the fact, that a perverse fashion is able to contaminate with rude and uncharitable vulgarity, minds of the first order, and of the best education. The statute book has however ceased to be the vehicle of scurrility, not only in Great Britain, but in the United States: during upwards of thirty years the calm and steady process of critical investigation has continued to rub away the stains which the reckless spirit of a bad and disastrous

[2] The passage here quoted is omitted, on account of its indecency: those whose taste resembles that of Luther, can find ample gratification by referring to his writings.

age had fastened upon those who were exhibited as too contemptible for association, too wicked for endurance, though not too poor to be victims of rapacity; for such was the state to which the Catholic subjects of the British crown were reduced by the potent spell of nicknames, and persevering audacity of unrestrained calumny. The plots with which they were charged are now acknowledged by the highest authorities to have been fictions: the credit of the Rev. Titis Oates, and the inscription of the London pillar, have vanished for ever. Great Britain no longer enacts laws to prevent the growth of Popery, but to emancipate Roman Catholics, she no longer confiscates the property of Papists, neither does she adjudge Romish ecclesiastics to be felons, nor will her polished society permit the feelings of their associates to be wounded by the vulgar phraseology, to perpetuate and to revive which an effort however is made by the over righteous; who eaten up with the zeal which devours them, lament the relaxation of the penal code, and the prospect of parliamentary reform; whilst they shed tears for the abominations of negro slavery, and muster their forces to obtain for that degenerate race, the sympathy which they denied to those with whom they had a more intimate relation. Whilst they bewail the destitution of the negro in Jamacia, they vociferate their abuse of the Irish papists, and exhibit a genuine specimen of the spirit with which they are possessed, in preventing the collection of funds for the relief of the starving Catholic population of Ireland, because the forlorn beings will not forego the convictions of their consciences, or purchase temporary relief by abominable hypocrisy. These are the men who at the other side of the Atlantic, would by the irritation of nicknames, add rancour to the excessive bitterness of sectarian animosity.

The colonies of Great Britain necessarily partook of the spirit of the mother country. Hence in the act of 1696-7 "for making aliens free of this part of the province, (Carolina,) and for granting liberty of conscience to all Protestants." We read in the enacting part, "That all Christians which now are, or hereafter may be in the provinec, (Papists only excepted) shall enjoy the full, free, and undisturbed liberty of their consciences," and so forth. It was the same in the other provinces at this period, as far as I can ascertain; and so far as the degredation of a nickname could be inflicted, it was legally and unsparingly bestowed. It will, my friends, not perhaps be amiss in this place to contrast the early legislation of what previous to that period was a Catholic colony, with the legislative practice which I thus impeach.

In March, 1638, chap. i. of the laws which the freemen of Maryland passed; the first part ordained "that the holy church [Roman

Catholic] within this province shall have all her rights and liberties." In the same session, in "A bill for the liberties of the people," the principle was recognised which constituted the uniform rule of the Catholic legislature of that province, viz. "All Christian inhabitants (slaves excepted) to have and enjoy such rights, liberties, immunities, privileges, and free customs within this province, as any natural born subject of England hath or ought to have or enjoy in the realm of England by force or virtue of the common law or statute law of England." Bill 19, "An act for peopling the province," describes the settlers to be recognised only by the name of Christians. In 1640, the act for church liberties was passed, which enacts that "holy church within this province shall have and enjoy all her rights, liberties, and franchises, wholly and without blemish." A number of Protestants having subsequently come into the province and made settlements, religious disputes began, and offensive language become annoying, the assembly of April, 1649, passed an act concerning religion, the 3d section of which enacts that "persons reproaching any other within the province by the name of or denomination of Heretic, Schismatic, Idolater, Puritan, Independent, Presbyterian, Papist-priest, Jesuit, Jesuited-Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Round-head Separatist, or any other name or term, in a reproachful manner relating to any matter of religion, should forfeit ten shillings sterling for each offence; one-half to the person reproached, the other half to the lord proprietor: or in default of payment, to be publicly whipped, and to suffer imprisonment without bail or mainprize, until the offender shall satisfy the party reproached, by asking him or her respectively forgiveness, publicly, for such an offence, before the chief officer or magistrate of the town or place where the offence shall be given."

Thus whilst the Roman Catholics vindicated the rights and liberties of their church, they not only laid the foundations of our religious liberty at this side of the Atlantic, but they gave equal protection to the feelings of their Protestant brethren as they claimed for their own. It is in the fifth section of this act, that the wise and just provision is contained, which gave Catholic Maryland the glorious prerogative of being the mother of the religious liberty of America.

The first exhibition of legal vulgarity that we find in the laws of Maryland is in the fourth of the acts passed at a general assembly held at Patuxent, on the 20th of October, 1654, by commission from his highness the Lord Protector, (Cromwell). But the reader will observe the manner in which every innovation is palpable, for this manifestly indicates its spirit by substituting the new appellation which was not

commonly known, but was invented to insult and to degrade, for the old name which, time out of mind, had designated the body which it was intended to vilify and to injure. This was also, "an act concerning religion," and it provided, "That none who professed and exercised the Popish (commonly called the Roman Catholic) religion, could be protected, in this province by the laws of England formerly established and not yet repealed." "That such as profess in God by Jesus Christ, though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship, or discipline publicly held forth, should not be restrained from, but be protected in the profession of their faith and exercise of their religion," "Provided such liberty should not be construed to extend to Popery, and so forth." And this was not opposed by the Protestant Episcopalians, who were received when they sought hospitality in Maryland from the Catholics, not being able to have a resting-place with the Puritans of New England; but it was chiefly enacted by the Puritans, who feeling the domination of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the old dominion, were hospitably received and warmed in the bosom of this Catholic colony of Maryland! This law ceased to operate in 1658, and the old law of 1649 gradually was restored to execution, and was made perpetual in 1676. But on the 23d of August, 1689, a convention met at St. Mary's "by virtue of letters missive from the several commanders, officers, and gentlemen associated in arms, for the defence of the Protestant religion, and asserting the title of William and Mary." Now this association had not the shadow of a pretext for charging their Catholic brethren with any, even an unkind expression, much less with any attempt to injure them, because of their religion; they were equally protected, represented and representatives as the Catholics; they had offices in more than their ratio of numbers: but now they assumed a monopoly, and Maryland not only saw the Catholics deprived of power, but placed under the operation of the English code of insult and persecution. It was therefore true that at the period of the Carolina act, 1696, the Catholics were equally insulted in the other provinces. Even Pennsylvania in this year, 1696, in the act of October the 26th, went no farther to secure religious liberty, than to enact that persons who made affirmation, that is Quakers, should be considered equally qualified as if they had sworn to the declaration of the first William and Mary, exempting their majesty's Protestant subjects dissenting from the church of England, from the penalties of certain laws: and under the laws in force at that period, the nicknames were in full vigour against the feelings of Roman Catholics, and Catholics were liable to the penalties. But Maryland, of all other provinces, was the most insulting, as she was the specially ungrateful.

I shall trouble you with only one instance as an example. In the year 1715 she passed a law, of which the following is the title—"An act, laying an imposition on negroes, and on several sorts of liquors imported, and also on Irish servants, to prevent importing too great a nubber of Irish Papists into this province." The naval officer was to execute this law. In 1717, the general assembly of Maryland again placed the negroes and Irish Papists on a level, and deeming it expedient to double the tax on the latter, did the same for their associates, lest there should be any jealousy. "An act for laying an additional duty of 20s. current money, per poll, on all Irish servants, being Papists, to prevent the growth of Popery, by the importation of too great a number of them into this Province: and also an additional duty of 20s. current money, per poll, on all negroes, for raising a fund, for the use of public schools within the several counties of this province." For the better discovery of the Papists, section ii. empowers and requires the naval officer to tender the oaths appointed by the act of assembly, as also the abjuration and the test to every Irish servant except children under fourteen years of age.

Thus habituated to the degradation of the members of our church, the feelings of the community became torpid upon the subject; and the man who would go to death itself rather than suffer a contumelious word, or the application of an epithet of contempt to himself, his party or his church, expected that a Catholic should quietly submit to the load of nicknames, which, with equal want of taste, of manners, and of charity, were now made familiar language of laws, and of society, in his regard.

It is true, my friends, there is an objection of which we are not altogether unmindful; one imposed upon us by Him, who, for our sakes, underwent not only mockery and contumely, but even death: by that obligation we should submit; and some of us have rejoiced to be thought worthy of contumely for his sake; and there is more Christian fortitude, evinced by the coercion of our feelings, than there is Christian charity in assailing them. We may, therefore, upon this score, profit by the insolence of which I complain.

As in Great Britain, so in America, the legislative bodies have grown too refined for this, formerly, fashionable vulgarity. Well-informed gentlemen have also learned to speak and to write with becoming dignity, and in appropriate language; but, unfortunately, when we cast our eyes around, and institute a general comparison, we must candidly avow, that in this respect we are as far behind Great Britain as she is behind the continent of Europe in this species of politeness.

I shall endeavour, in my next, to account for this unpleasant blot upon our social condition, and exhibit a few specimens to sustain the position which I here assume.

Yours, respectfully, B. C.

LETTER II

Proscripti Regis Rupili pus atque venenum
Ibrida quo pacto sit Persius ultus opinor
Omnibus et lippis notum et tonsoribus esse.

Horace.

How mongrel Persius, in his wrathful mood,
That outlaw'd wretch, Rupilius King, pursued
With poisonous filth, and venom all his own,
To barbers and to blear-ey'd folk is known.

Francis.

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 25, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—In my former letter I endeavoured to show you the origin of the nicknames, Antichrist, Papist, Beast, Babylon, Romanist, Romish, Popish, Scarlet Whore, and so forth, applied to the Pope, to Roman Catholics, and to the Catholic Church. I have been, perhaps, somewhat prolix in the exhibition of facts to enable you to solve the apparent difficulty, how well educated gentlemen could be degraded into vulgarity; and in doing this, I have brought to your view a melancholy picture; its colours were bold and flaming, and its shades were very dark; it was no common spectacle. You have seen the Irish Catholic, upon his arrival in America, legally degraded to the level of the negro-slave; and this in a province where, when all around, in every other settlement of this country, the most heartless bigotry held unrestricted sway, Catholics, under the spiritual administration of Jesuits, first kindled at the fire of Christian charity that torch of religious freedom which was subsequently quenched in their own tears. Do! my friends, allow me the poor, but the gratifying consolation of cherishing, with fondness that increases with my years, the memory of those good Catholic freemen of Maryland, who erected for the American citizens of after times that beacon light, which, though extinguished by others, yet, after the days of captivity had passed away, blazed forth upon the first sacrifices having been offered upon the altar of liberty, as did that sacred flame which the priests of Israel hid upon their going to Babylon, but which was miraculously reproduced in the days of Nehemias. Yes!

my friends, the associates may sneer at me, for my "man-worship," if they will; they may cry, "to the law and the testimony," whose meaning they mistake; they may appear zealous for the honour of that God by whose charity and whose justice those good men, whose memory I hold in benediction, were led; they may proclaim me an idolater, but, in this respect, I feel in their regard what an old Irish Catholic chieftain expressed even after a field of disaster, where his son had fallen in the glorious discharge of a noble duty. "I would not give my dead son for all the living heroes they possess." No! my friends! That single clause of the law which they enacted to prohibit nicknames in 1649, is of more value, in my estimation, than if all the mail stages in the Union should be obliged to stop, from midnight on Saturday to midnight on Sunday; than if every man, woman, and child was compelled, on the Lord's day, to live on cold food, and all the mothers to be prohibited from kissing their children on the Sabbath, as it is called! Excuse me for this ebullition of feeling, into the restraint of which I have not yet been subdued.

I need not inform you, that the changes in religion, which I cannot be expected to call a reformation, did not stop exactly at that point which they who made the first alterations thought proper to prescribe. The principles of the Catholic Church are, that faith is the belief of what God has taught; that all men are bound to believe his revelation; that it was perfected by Jesus Christ; that this divine Saviour commissioned his Apostles and those whom they should associate to their body, and the regular successors in that tribunal, to testify those doctrines to the world; and that under his protection, though a few individuals might err, yet that infallibly the vast majority of this tribunal will always testify that which came down from the beginning; and that the doctrine of Christ was to be ascertained by the testimony of this tribunal, and not by the conjectures of individuals! When they who, with Luther, separated from the great body, and opposed the tribunal, undertook to judge, each for himself, the meaning of the sacred volume, they destroyed all claim of authority in any tribunal, to require of any individual submission to its testimony, or to learn from it: all their members claimed to be each taught of God; vast numbers claimed the privilege of divine inspiration, and whilst, with one accord, they all proclaimed that no assembly was infallibly correct in the interpretation of the sacred volume, nor even in ascertaining what books were inspired by the Holy Ghost, yet each individual spoke and acted as if he was himself infallible. The Church of England having separated from the Catholic Church, which she accused of error, could claim no higher privi-

lege for herself; and she felt exceedingly awkward and ridiculous in declaring that they who, imitating her own example, differed from her in doctrine, and separated from her, were heretics. Every reasonable person must instantly perceive that it would be, in this state of things, palpably absurd to expect unity of doctrine; or for any person to undertake, upon those principles, to determine who was right, or who was wrong. Every man gave his opinion as to what Christ taught, but no one could be certain that his opinion was the doctrine of the Apostles; because there was scarcely a doctrine upon which all were agreed. The Bible was for them, not a book of peace and reconciliation, but was an occasion of dispute and discord. Notwithstanding the dictations of Luther, the divisions of the continental Protestants daily multiplied. And in spite of the power of the British government, the Church of England found herself assailed by a more restless and a more worrying foe than the Papists, by the Reformers of the Reformation. I shall not enter into their history; my object is merely to continue the history of nicknames, and to discover the spirit which has preserved them.

The various divisions of Presbyterians and Independents, who desired to purify the Church of England from what they called the dregs of Popery, now turned the weapons of that unfortunate church against herself. She had abused Papists, and they called her members Papists in disguise; all that the Church of England had said of Romanists and the Beast, the Puritans gave back to herself, with such usury as would have contented the most demure and sober-minded and avaricious money-lender. Thus, in their mutual scurrility, there was one neutral ground on which they met, one postulate, was fully conceded by each to the other, viz: That no abuse could be too bad for the Papists; and that the highest offence which either could give to the other would be, to assert that it bore some mark of the beast. So that, even in their mutual conflicts, the Roman Catholic Church was the greatest sufferer; and men became accustomed to consider the propriety of our degradation as perfectly unquestionable. Allow me, however disgusting they may be, to give you a few specimens of the manner in which the Puritans made their onslaught.

Bishop Bancroft, in his *Dangerous Positions*, book 2, chapter 9, gives us the following specimen of the manner in which the nonconformists assailed the English Protestant Church: "Christ's religion is fondly patched with the Pope's; the communion book is an imperfect book, culled and picked out of that Romish dunghill, the *Portyse* [3] *and Mass-book*. The sacraments are wickedly mingled and profaned; they

[3] *Portyrse* signifies *Breviary*. It is also written *Portise, Portars, Portuary*.—Ed.

eat not the Lord's supper, but play a pageant of their own to blind the people; their pomps, rites, laws, and traditions are anti-Christian, carnal, beggarly Popish fooleries, Romish relics, and rags of Antichrist, dregs and remnants of transformed Popery; Pharisaical outward faces and vizzards, remnants of Romish Antichrist, a cursed leaven of a cursed blasphemous priesthood, known liveries of Antichrist; cursed patches of Popery and idolatry, they are worse than lousie."

One of their orators declaiming before the Parliament on September 24, 1656, praising God for delivering them from the Protestant Episcopal Church of England, described the observances of that species of Protestants. "Altar genuflexions, cringing, with crossings, and all that Popish trash and trumpery"—"the removal of these insupportable burdens countervailed for the blood and treasure shed and spent in the late distractions." The following curious scrap from page 25 of the *Cavalier's Catechism*, exhibits the spirit in which the assault was made upon the Church of England under the name of the Church of Rome. It was a burlesque upon the Catechism of the English Protestant Church. "Ques. What is your name? Ans. Cavalier. Ques. Who gave you that name? Ans. My seducers and deceivers in my innocence, wherein I was made a member of the Church of Rome, and consequently a limb of Antichrist, an enemy to all godliness, a child of the Devil, an inheriter of the kingdom of darkness, amongst the infernal spirits that rule in the air of this terestrial globe."

Nalson, in his *Collections*, volume 1, page 499, gives us the following: "Cardinals, patriarchs, primates, metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, deans, and innumerable such vermin, a monster of which monstrous body our (English Protestant) hierarchy is . . . never came from God,—but rather from the Pope and the Devil; *Diabolus cacavit illos.*"

A compound of holy writers, whose initials gave the word smectymnius, thus describe the English Protestant Church: "This many-headed monster, ... is the beast against which we fight in the covenant. Thy mother, Papacy, shall be made childless amongst harlots."

In Case's sermon, at Milk Street, September 30, 1643, the clergy of the Protestant Church of England are called "swearing, drunken, unclean priests, that taught nothing but rebellion in Israel, and caused the people to abominate the sacrifice of the Lord. Arminian, Popish, idolatrous, vile wretches, such as, had Job been alive, he would not have set with the dogs of his flock."

Vicar, in his *Jehovah Jerah* calls them "a stinking heap of atheistical Roman rubbish, a rotten rabble of slanderous priests, and spuri-

ous bastard sons of Belial, who by their affected ignorance and laziness, by their most abominable lives and conversations, had made the Lord's ordinance to be even abhorred by the people."

In 1720, a Church of England Protestant, complaining of the violent abuse of the clergy of that church, by those Puritans who charged them with ignorance, debauchery, and villainy, after mentioning those charges, adds, "But this the clergy can forgive, provided their enemies would forbear to charge them with vices of Popery: or a reconciliation with the Church of Rome, . . they will always go on steadily to oppose Popery, though they should be traduced as favourers of it, by those very Presbyterians, who in the day of distress, were busy in breaking down those fences by which alone it was to be kept out." This writer in another place abuses the Presbyterians for being so exceedingly wicked as not to hate Popery; he tells them that in the reign of James II., "the dissenters, (to their eternal shame and conviction be it spoken,) paid all their addresses and compliments to the government, and accepted many insinuating favours from it, which the Church of Englandmen refused upon principles of conscience. But these good men notwithstanding their pretended stiffness against Popery at other times, could then comply with anything, if they could but lessen the esteem and authority of the church; and come Popery, or whatever else, were very easy and caressed themselves; and if our establishment had been borne down, it is certain that nothing but Popery could possibly have been established in the room; for fanaticism is so wild and so untractable a thing, that it admits of no settlement upon any principles."

You must, my friends, be as heartily tired of these quotations as I am; I leave them for the present to remind you of what I intended by their introduction. It is then a plain fact, that the various religious sects that worried each other in England and in Scotland during the seventeenth century, united in abusing and censuring the Roman Catholic Church, as the most vile and loathsome and dangerous and wicked and pestilential of all institutions; and that when either desired to render the other obnoxious, it had recourse to what it considered the most easy and effectual mode of success, a charge of affection to what it called Popery. The Church of England and the Independents each, indeed, proved with melancholy evidence the utter want of foundation for such imputations; because each of them contended with the other in the enactment of barbarous laws and the invention of degrading epithets, and the expressions of scorn, of hatred, and of contempt. Thus the religion of the great bulk of the civilized world was made an object of contumely to those contending factions, and to all to whom their in-

fluence extended. The New England colonies were principally settled by the Puritans, those of Virginia, by the members of the law-church, or English Protestant Episcopalians; each division brought with it across the Atlantic the same spirit and the same language that it had in the land whence it came; and thus this barbarous and degrading nomenclature was diffused through the colonies. We have seen the ineffectual effort of the Catholics to preserve at least one spot free from the domination of vulgarity, and unprofaned by the spirit of persecution. We have seen the power of that Catholic colony broken down; and the professors of that religion degraded to the level of the negro slave.

France and Spain, two great and powerful nations had colonies to the north and to the south; they were also approaching upon the west: these colonies were Catholic, and the policy of Great Britain urged her to increase the hatred and the contempt for their religion, the better to guard against the alienation of her own colonies, by means of any combination with them. Thus was there upon the ground which we now occupy, a population trained up by such circumstances into the strongest prejudices against the Catholic Church, and without any mode whatever of correcting its serious mistakes. Europe was differently circumstanced; Catholics were there seen and known, and observed. What must have been the situation of the American colonist, when the usual impression upon the mind of John Bull was, that the Pope really was not a man like his fellows, that he was some undefined kind of strange and dangerous animal? I know an excellent priest, who within a very short time, has, to my astonishment, convinced me that aged and respectable persons in the interior of Virginia, have seriously examined his head, at his own request, to be satisfied that a Popish priest had not small horns. I have evidence of nearly a similar description in North Carolina. The familiar and ordinary phraseology of many in our states respecting our church and its members, still, is the nick-nomenclature; and though it has scarcely ever prevailed in the Protestant countries upon the continent of Europe, and been nearly exploded from the more polished parts of Great Britain, as well as disused in her legislative and judicial halls; and has also been discardeed by our legislatures, still an effort is made by the party called Evangelical,[4] to continue it in Great Britain and Ireland; and persons otherwise well educated and not usually vulgar, unconsciously offend others and degrade themselves by its continuance here. Would to God, I could attribute

[4] The same ridiculous and vulgar phraseology is also studiously affected by a certain section of the High Church party.

to ignorance the habit of the editors of what are called our religious periodicals! They cannot avail themselves of this excuse. What then are we to think of the kind disposition, the Christian humility, the affability, the politeness, the courtesy, the charity, and the education of the editor of the *Southern Religious Telegraph*, who, in a short paragraph, gives us the following specimen of his claims to the character of a Christian gentleman?

"Popery has invaded the land." "Popery should be noticed in connexion with intemperance." "It stupifies the conscience." "It blinds the understanding." "It makes the whole man a superstitious slave to the impositions of a crafty priesthood." "The beast numbers half a million of subjects in these United States." "Popery is a monster, forging chains to bind the people."

All this is gathered from one pargarph compiled by this writer in an essay put forward to instruct his readers how to offer their sacrifice of praise to God, on the anniversary of our Independence, when every good man would endeavour to unite his fellow-citizens into one great harmonious band, to pay their grateful homage for a mighty and an invaluable common benefit? Yes! it is in affecting to call upon his readers to make a due celebration of that day when twenty-four confederated republics rejoice in their freedom, that this man vilifies with his foul obloquy the religion of the only venerated survivor of that band of patriots who staked their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honour to procure that boon for which he affects gratitude! Nor was this writer ignorant of this fact! nor was he unaware of the insulting nature of his language.

But suppose against all the evidence which I possess, and I have much, that this man was not aware of the vile character of his phraseology, as above quoted. Surely no one will undertake to offer an excuse for his classing Roman Catholics with "drunkards," "profane swearers," "sabbath breakers," "gamblers," "all votaries of dissipation whose example is pernicious to the community." And this he deliberately does in an article directing his compatriots how to celebrate the anniversary of our Independence! Will he have the hardihood to assert that the Roman Catholic Church teaches men to become "drunkards," or sanctions intemperance? Can he perceive no efforts of that church to take away utterly the abomination of profane swearing? Does she not by her own special regulations endeavour to bring to close practical operation the general command for the sanctification of one day in the week? Does she not lament and reprove the misconduct and negligence of such of her children as disregard or undervalue the divine

ordinance? Does she not uniformly teach that "gambling" is not only injustice, [5] but is closely allied to a variety of other crimes? In opposing "dissipation," is she not charged by her enemies with being too severe and harsh and superstitious in the recommendation and estimation of her works of self-denial and mortification? But the object was to fasten obloquy upon our body, to degrade us by nicknames, to mortify us by superciliousness, to estrange our fellow-citizens from us by contempt, and to deprive us of sympathy by daubing us with the colouring of the most despicable vices. There was however an ulterior object, to attain which this is only a preparation.

My friends—look through the publications of this confederacy, and you will at once perceive that, as regards us, obloquy is their usual style, vulgar nicknames their usual appellations; and though our church contains more than three-fifths of all Christendom in her communion, and has in her bosom, at least, that ratio of the talent, of the science, of the virtue, in a word, of all the good qualities of the civilized world; yet this combination of sections of sects affects to look down upon us as if we were beings carelessly flung into some lower region, upon whom these self-complacent, refined, and chosen spirits may occasionally cast a glance from their empyreal sphere. Yet fallen and degraded as I am, I shall venture humbly to suggest to these mighty ones in Israel, that even for them it might prove beneficial to ponder occasionally upon that beautiful parable which commences at the ninth verse of chapter xviii, of the Gospel according to *St. Luke.*

Meantime I remain,

Your's respectfully, B. C.

LETTER III

For if the Devil to serve his turn,
Can tell truth; why the Saints shall scorn,
When it serves theirs, to swear and lie;
I think there's little reason why:
Else he has a greater pow'r than they;
Which 'twere impiety to say.

Hudibras.

[5] The Church does not teach that gambling is a sin against justice. Considered in itself, gambling is no sin. If the gambler is unqualified master of the money he places in jeopardy—if he abstains from all fraud and treachery—if he takes with his opponents equal chances of winning or losing—then he violates no law of justice and can not be accused of sin. The Church, indeed, does strongly discountenance all forms of gambling, not because of the act itself, but by reason of the many grave evils ordinarily associated with games of chance.—Ed.

You will but make it blush,
And glow with shame of your proceedings, Hubert.
King John.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 1, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced people of America.

My Friends:—I have brought down the history of the nicknames with sufficient detail and accuracy. It might be asked what can prompt their infliction? I shall remark that in the base and ignoble portion of the human family, there exists a strong and almost uncontrollable propensity to inflict every species of pain upon its opponents, and that this melancholy exhibition is often adduced as one of the evidences of our fallen and degraded state. In those who are strong and powerful, that propensity finds its indulgence in the bodily pain or destruction which it inflicts: when the hatred is excessive, even this will not suffice: contumely is added to the injury, and hence, in that state of warfare which Homer describes between demi-savages, the hero is as powerful at wounding the soul with his tongue, as he is at wounding the body with his spear. The Indian loses half his revenge, if he cannot vent his malice in vituperation. But Christianity weeps over the victim that justice consigns to pain or to death, and even soothes the soul of the malefactor with the balm of religion. When she authorizes the patriot to arm for the protection of his rights, she conjures him to recollect that his hand is strengthened for the ruin of a brother, and she charges him as he will answer for it at the tribunal of Heaven, to strike no unnecessary blow, and to seek for no revenge. She commands him whilst he will devotedly expose himself and powerfully vindicate justice, yet to remember mercy, and to bathe with the tear of humanity that gash, which public right compels for the unnerving of an unjust aggressor. Thus does she breathe the airs of Heaven through the field of carnage, and exhibit her chosen warriors, calm, intrepid, charitable, and dignified; the bulwark of their nation, the terror of its foes, able to repel the mighty, and then prepared to stoop to the solace of the fallen. From their mouths no ribaldry proceeds, for their hearts cherish no hatred.

But there are several who, unable to injure you, vent their impotent rage in abusive language; and that fury which, in the strong, was divided between the hand and the tongue, here issues altogether from the mouth; so that as the being is powerless, it becomes ribald; and you may generally calculate its strength to be in the inverse ratio of its vulgar volubility. The veteran who has, during a half a century, braved the varied perils of the field, the trench, the ambuscade, and the forlorn-hope; who could, with truth, say, as the high-priest did to Abner, that

he feared God, but had no other fear. This brave man, upon whose single word a countless host of undaunted heroes move, gladly resigns the inglorious palm of wounding words and vituperative phraseology, to a drab of the market, redolent of fish, and bloated with her blustering. And well he may, for this is the appropriate field of the weak and the vulgar.

But is this harmless, save as the feelings are assailed and worried? No, my friends, there are other consequences which naturally follow, and which, perhaps, I would be warranted in asserting to have been intended. It is commonly told of a man who appeared to be calm, prudent, peaceable, kind, and charitable, that once taking a dislike, for some unaccountable cause, to a very quiet and inoffensive dog, he determined upon his destruction; but it would not only be unbecoming in Amasiah to stain his hand in blood, but, moreover, the attempt might be accompanied by its peculiar risk, and a dog which would be grateful and affectionate, whilst permitted to live, and meeting some kindness, would, probably, in self-defence, bite any one who manifested a disposition to slay him. Pondering upon those things, Amasiah prudently determined not to do the unseemly deed, yet did he give himself much to reflection; and on what seemed to him a fitting occasion, when poor Tray was, on one of the dog-days, passing through the street, with extended jaws and outstretched tongue, to inhale some coolness, our sober friend humanely pointed him out to a neighbour, whose child had just gone in the direction to which the dog was quietly proceeding. "Friend Charles, I think thee had better be careful in these days, of rabid animals. Thy son is, I think, down the street." Away flew the parent, and observing Tray approach his child, vociferated to him "avoid that mad dog." The child ran; one and another, and a third flung some missle at the animal; no one stopped to inquire the ground of the charge; the terrified mastiff now ran with a host of pursuers at his heels, he occasionally barked, he sometimes snapped at dog or man that approached; the glare of his eyes, indeed, became wild, and the multitude of his assailants increased; their fury soon incapacitated him for flight, and shot, and swords, and stones made his carcass a shapeless mass, before friend Amasiah had completed the calculation of compound interest upon the bond of a debtor who had come to make a partial settlement, just as neighbour Charles commenced the pursuit. No one condoled more sincerely with the owner of Tray for the loss of his very valuable animal, than did Amasiah, though he indeed admitted that he had spoken with his neighbour as to the propriety of guarding against rabid animals, yet far be it from him to say that the faithful Tray was such; but it was

natural that Charles should be careful for his child. Yet was the good man sometimes inconsiderate; and it was not Charles, but the thoughtless rabble that deprived the poor animal of life.

The common sense of mankind has long since discovered, and the discovery now is admitted as an axiom. "That the public degredation of any individual or body by nicknames, or continual imputations, however undeserved or groundless, is for the direction of public opinion, fully equivalent to the demonstration of the charges which they intimate." Thus in Great Britain and her colonies, it was scarcely deemed necessary, even for the purpose of gratifying curiosity, to examine into the grounds of any of the vague and monstrous, and frequently self-contradictory libels upon the Roman Catholics. The very name of Papist was synonymous with everything base, vile, and degrading; Popery was the most expressive word in the English language for all that was abominable; and, generally speaking, mad dog was not more fatal to the quadruped, than Romanist or Papist to the biped. I shall give you one or two instances out of several which lie within my reach.

You are aware that, by the law of 1696, no Roman Catholic was permitted to profess his religion in Carolina; and this law was not repealed at the time of the Revolution. As far as I can discover, no clergyman of that church ever entered Carolina previous to 1783; no one was stationed in it until several years later; until 1821 there was no station for a mission or a priest, in South Carolina, outside the city of Charleston. In 1790, there was considerable difficulty in obtaining the means of very poor support for one priest in this city.

With those facts before us, I would ask, what was the number of Catholics in this state in 1774, and in 1775? I believe that scarcely ten could be discovered. We shall find that there were two, and their history is not altogether uninteresting.

In 1774, Judge Drayton informs us in his *Memoirs,* (vol. 1, p. 136) that about the month of August, news arrived in Charlestown, (now Charleston,) that an act had been passed in the British Parliament, extending the limits of the government of Quebec, and amongst other things "establishing therein the Roman Catholic religion." He should rather have said, permitting the people to follow the Catholic religion, which they always professed, and establishing the Protestant as the government religion. Almost every one of the colonies complained loudly of this act of toleration; and there was scarcely one of them that did not mark it down as a tyrannical assault by the British king upon their Protestant rights and liberties, and such as was likely to bring down the curse of God upon him. I shall here allow Judge Drayton

to describe the feelings of the former inhabitants of that city in which I write.

"These acts sunk deep into the minds of the people, as they saw the crown now made despotic, and the Romish Church established in a part of America. Men openly said, George III had broken his coronation oath; as well as the solemn contract, under which he received his title to the crown. They said, the Revolution of 1688 was effected upon a principle of rescuing the English dominions from the errors and tyranny of the Romish Church. That for this effect, William, Prince of Orange, had been placed on the British throne; and after him the ancestor, from whom George III derived his royal titles; and that he was bound by the same conditions. Under these reflections, the meeting of the General Assembly now approached, and the representatives with impatience wished for an opportunity of declaring in a legislative manner, their sentiments respecting the late obnoxious acts of Parliament."

Would to God I could acquit the Congress of 1774 of acts upon this subject, which should be effaced by my tears, if shedding them in the bitterness of my heart could blot the record from their journals! But enough of this. I must subdue the feeling which tempts me to place in contrast the declarations made by that body to the Protestants of what are now our republics, and those made by them to the Catholics of Quebec! Was I previously ignorant of the want of value in political professions, this would be an abundant lesson. Let it rest! Suffice for my present purpose to show that nicknames and groundless imputations had destroyed the fair name of Catholics in this part of America. Judge Drayton gives in his memoirs, p. 226, another instance, which shows us the force of association. The occurrence took place in April, 1775.

"With all these occurrences, men's minds had become agitated; and it was deemed proper to bring forth something calculated to arrest the public attention, to throw odium on the British administration, to put down the crown-officers in the province, and to invigorate the ardour of the people. And nothing was deemed more likely to effect the same, than some public exhibition, which might speak to the sight and senses, of the multitude. For this purpose, effigies were brought forward—supposed to be by the authority or connivance of the Secret Committee. They were executed under the direction of Mr. Poyas, in the Masonic lodge-room, in Lodge Alley; and represented the Pope, Lord Grenville, Lord North, and the Devil. They were placed on the top of a frame, capable of containing one or two persons within it, and the frame was covered over with thick canvass, so that those within could not be distinguished. In the front of the frame, on the top, the Pope was seated in a chair of state, in his pontifical dress; and at a distance immediately behind him, the Devil was placed in a standing position, holding a barbed dart in his right hand; between the Pope and the Devil on each side, Lords Grenville and North were stationed. Thus finished, the frame and effigies were fixed on four wheels; and early in the morning, this uncommon spectacle was stationed between the Market[6] and St. Michael's church, in Broad Street, to the gaze of the citizens. Many were the sur-

[6] The Beef Market was then, where the elegant building of the City Hall is at present.

mises respecting it; but at length, by its evolutions, it soon began to explain the purposes for which it was constructed; for no sooner did any of the crown-officers, placemen, counsellors, or persons known to be disaffected to the common cause pass by, than the Pope immediately bowed with proportioned respect to them; and the Devil, at the same moment, striking his dart at the head of the Pope, convulsed the populace with bursts of laughter. While, on the other hand, the immovable effigies of Lords Grenville and North, appearing like attendants on the Pope, or criminals, moved the people with sentiments of disgust and contempt against them, and the whole British administration, for the many oppressive acts which they had been instrumental in procuring to be passed through both houses of Parliament. In this manner, the machine was exposed, after which it was paraded through the town the whole day, by the mob; and in the evening they carried it beyond the town, where, surrounding it with tar barrels, the whole was committed to the flames. Nor did the idea or influence of the thing end here—for boys forsook their customary sports to make models like it, with which, having amused themselves and roused their youthful spirits into a detestation of oppression, they also committed them to the flames. And many of those very boys supported, with their services and blood, the rights and liberties of their country.

"On this occasion, Edward Weyman, a member of the Secret Committee of five, was of the persons within the machine, who directed the operation of the machinery; and to his knowledge of the men and characters he had to deal with, the public were indebted, no doubt, for the significant bows of respect which the Pope so appropriately paid to all those who preferred taxation and royalty, to liberty and social happiness. Mr. Weyman being so engaged in the plot, naturally associates the Secret Committee with him in the scheme; as it has been already stated, that when that committee was originated, Mr. Weyman was expressly nominated as one of them, on account of the active and confidential services he could render."

Now, my friends, at this period, the British ministers would incur the penalties of a præmunire, or be put out of the protection of the law, if they should hold any communication with the Pope; the British administration persecuted Roman Catholics with the utmost virulence; yet they are here brought together, as the most likely way of throwing odium upon the British ministry; they are made the sport of schoolboys, and made companions of the devil. We should feel exceedingly grateful to Messrs. Weyman and Poyas, and to the other members of the Secret Committee, for this appropriate compliment.

When the members of any body are thus held up to public scorn and detestation, it is an easy and a natural transition to maltreat them with impunity; especially in a community where they are exceedingly few in number, and have neither wealth, power, nor friends. Such was the case of the few unfortunate Catholics, who, in defiance of the law, skulked in some of the obscure purlieus of Charleston, where this exhibition took place. Without a priest, without an altar, without property, without political existence; hated and despised in Carolina, persecuted by Great Britain; who could imagine it possible that two or three

insignificant outcasts of this description, could even be suspected of opposing themselves openly to the vengeance of a people? Who could imagine the possibility of their openly assailing with arms and threatening with death the patriotic Protestants of the city? Who could swallow the assertion, that at such a time, and after such an exhibition, there should be danger of their escaping through the partiality of the judicial tribunals? Yet, my friends, there were in this city men who, having discovered two Roman Catholics, set up these pretexts as a cover for the ill-treatment they were doomeed to undergo.

"The following petition[7] was transferred over to the Secret Committee, who acted upon it.

"*To the Honourable Members of the Committee of Correspondence, at Charleston, the humble petition of Michael Hubart, showeth*:

"That upon the 2d day of June, your petitioner being in the house of Thomas Nicoll, in King Street, a certain James Dealey came in, and told there was good news come to town. Being answered what was it, he answered that a number of arms was sent over to be distributed amongst the negroes, Roman Catholics, and Indians. Upon which your petitioner replied he thought it was very bad news, that Roman Catholics and savages should be permitted to join and massacre Christians. Upon which Dealey struck his breast and swore, 'he was a Roman Catholic, and that he had arms, and would get arms, and use them as he pleased.' Your petitioner went home to his house, and shortly after came in said Dealey, and a certain Laughlin Martin, and A—— Reed.

"After sitting down a little, Laughlin Martin arose and said, 'So, Mr. Hubart, you'll not allow Roman Catholics to carry guns.' Your petitioner answered that his circumstances were too small to forbid any party or sect to carry arms. Martin then damned your petitioner for a false-faced villian; and declared he would believe Dealey sooner than me; at same time ordered said Dealey to drag your petitioner out of the house and pull him to pieces. At the same time standing with a drawn cutteau in his hand, swearing if he did not, that he (Martin) would have blood himself. Dealey then dragged your petitioner into a shop in front of the house, holding him by the throat until released by the aforesaid Reed. But, upon being released, said Martin came up, with his cutteau drawn, threatening to put your petitioner to immediate death, when your petitioner, falling upon his knees, begged his life; your petitioner's wife and children begging, at the same time, to spare the life of their father and husband. Your petitioner then arose and went into the next room, but was still followed by Martin, who vowed to God if your petitioner did not beg pardon of Dealey, he would, that instant, cut off his head. Upon which your petitioner, to save his life, did ask his (Dealey's) pardon.

"Martin then declared he was a Roman Catholic, and vowed to God to cut off the head of any person who said he should not carry arms.

"After which, said Martin called for some drink, and drank of it with Dealey and Reed; and one of his toasts was, 'Damnation to the committee and their proceedings.'

[7] Drayton's *Memoirs*, p. 300.

"Your petitioner has prosecuted them as law directs. But as the times appear to be very troublesome, and numbers of enemies, both to the Protestant interest and the present cause, are lurking amongst us, your petitioner hopes that you will inquire into such parts of their transaction as concerns the public; and your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

"MICHAEL HUBART.

"Secret, tar and feather him.[8]

"Passed the Secret Committee, and ordered to be put in execution.[9]

☞"On the back of the petition is written, in the real hand writing of William Henry Drayton, the chairman of the Secret Committee, the following, viz.:

LOCHLIN MARTIN,[10]
JAMES DEALEY."[11]

The result is thus stated by Drayton, page 273:

"During the events which took place about this time, and of which mention has been made, it is of some consequence to observe that in the course of June of this year (1775), Laughlin Martin, and James Dealey, having behaved in a very improper manner respecting the general committee and their proceedings, as well as respecting the association; and having threatened Michael Hubart with death, unless he begged their pardon for having justified the conduct of the committee, he sent a petition respecting the affair to the committee of correspondence of Charlestown. This committee immediately transferred it to the secret committee of five, who, having considered the same, ordered both Martin and Dealey to be tarred and feathered. The order was promptly put in execution by suitable agents; and they were both stripped of their clothes, tarred, feathered, and carted through the streets of Charlestown; affording the first instance of such a spectacle in this colony. This being done, the Secret Committe sent them on board a ship ready to sail for England; Laughlin Martin was, however, permitted to land again, and was discharged on expressing his contrition in a public manner, but James Dealey, for an example, was sent away. These summary measures have been supposed by writers to have proceeded from the intemperate zeal of the populace; and there can be no doubt but many of them took their rise from that source. But there can be as little doubt this first commencement of so ludicrous and disgraceful a punishment owed its origin, in South Carolina, to this very case."

Now I am confident that the unfortunate beings who were thus selected to undergo this "ludicrous and disgraceful punishment," endured it, not because they were guilty, but because they were of the class of mad dogs. Just think, for a moment of the apprehensions of the sweet and veracious Michael Hubart, that in the year 1775, the "enemies to the Protestant interest" were so numerous in this city, as that a Protestant judge, and a Protestant jury, and Protestant prose-

[8] This order is in a disguised hand, supposed to be that of William Henry Drayton, chairman of the Secret Committee.

[9] This certificate is also in a disguised hand, supposed to be that of Edward Weyman, one of the members of the Secret Committee.

[10] To land, and be discharged, upon his expressing his contrition in the most public manner.

[11] Send away.

cutors, and there could be none other, would be afraid to punish a Catholic malefactor!!! Only imagine the heroism and prowess of so formidable an array as Dealey and Martin, compelling so good a Protestant as Hubart, surrounded by his friends in so large a city, to save his precious life upon such ignominious terms!! Only figure to yourself the terror which pervaded the Protestant forces of this good city when the redoubted Martin brandished his glittering cutteau!!! But how fallen are the mighty! How fickle is Dame Fortune! The laurels had not yet faded on the brows of the victors ere the chaplets are torn from their heads; and that "Protestant interest" which was so feeble, and which had so many enemies, boldly leads them, in unresisted triumph, covered with their clucking honours, through the enraptured city. Not a hand is lifted to avenge the insult; not an eye is noticed to weep for their disgrace!! And, after the lapse of half a century, a venerable judge of the land writes the record of this inglorious, this illegal, this despotic outrage, without a single observation of censure!

Now, my friends, notwithstanding the effort of the notable Michael Hubart to identify negroes, Roman Catholics, and Indians, and to exhibit the Roman Catholics and savages as leagued for the massacre of Christians, I apprehend you will believe with me that, in all likelihood, this was another of Mr. Weyman's devices, "calculated to arrest public attention and to throw odium on the British administration."

Thus the process is natural and easy from nicknames to ill-treatment, from degradation to the loss of sympathy, and to the excommunication from the charities of society and the protection of power. Would you insure the destruction of a wretched dog, you need only insinuate that he is mad. Am I asked what is the object of the sanctified host of our opponents, in their obstinate persistence in vulgar contumely: let this letter be the reply. It must be the expression of a low but impotent disposition to hurt our feelings, since they are restrained from injuring our persons; or it is to make us odius, that we may be injured. If there be any other, let it be assigned.

I remain, my friends,

Yours respectfully, B. C.

LETTER IV

Θερσίτης δ' ἔτι μενος ἀμετροεπὴς ἐκολώα,
"Ο ρ' ἔπεα φρεσιν ἦσιν ἥσιν ἄχοσμά τε πολλὰ τε ἦση
Μὰψ, ἀτὰρ ε κατὰ κόσμον, ἐριξέμεναι βασίλευσιν,
Ἀλλ', ὃ, τι οἱ εἴσαιτο γελοίϊον Αρλείοισιν.

Homer.

Thersites only clamour'd in the throng,
Loquacious, loud, and turbulent of tongue:
Awed by no shame, by no respect controll'd,
In scandal busy, in reproaches bold:
With witty malice studious to defame;
Scorn all his joy, and laughter all his aim:
But chief be glorified with licentious style,
To lash the great and monarchs to revile.

Pope.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 8, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—I will not assert that the object of our evangelical opponents is to procure Roman Catholics being tarred and feathered; on the contrary, I believe they have no such object. But I do state that I believe their intention in continuing the use of nicknames is, first, to bring Catholics into contempt; and secondly, to deprive them of sympathy, and to excite against them suspicions of the worst kind and subject them to unmerited distrust, and to its natural consequences.

The editor of the Telegraph, besides using the nomenclature which I have before exhibited, tells his readers that "Popery should be noticed in connexion with intemperance." Let any person who possesses self-respect as a man, or any portion of religious sentiment, ask himself what is the estimation in which the drunkard should be held. Let him view the body unnerved, the countenance bloated, the eye dull, the dress slovenly, and covered with the stains of vomit: contemplating this personification, let him ask, "Is that the representation of a Catholic?" The mouth-piece of the brotherhood will tell him that it is, and will call the Catholic beast. Let him view the pictures drawn of the intemperate in all the associated publications; let him ask what is the object of the writers, of the preachers, of the societies; is it not to cover intemperance with the contempt, and the disgust, and the hatred of the community? When, therefore, we are told by the same associates "that Popery should be noticed in connexion with intemperance," is it not their intention to cover Catholics with the contempt, and the disgust, and the hatred of the community? Yet these are your men of sublime charity! These your men of tender mercy! These your men who oppose bigotry! These the only men who seek to preserve our republican affections!

Look around, my friends, review your Catholic neighbours, and ask yourselves do they deserve this contumely? Are they justly exposed to this hatred? We have seen the manner in which they were treated previous to the Revolution, in what were then the colonies. I have given

you only a few specimens; I can, if necessary, multiply them to disgusting satiety. Then they were charged by the legislative bodies, by the popular assemblies, and by individuals, with a slavish spirit, with perfidious designs, with leaguing with negroes and savages for the extermination of Christians, to the destruction of freedom. It is not for me here to say, how they behaved in the contest. In their own address to President Washington, they tell him, "Whilst our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well-founded title to claim from her justice the equal rights of citizenship, as the price of our blood, spilt under your eyes, and our common exertions for her defence, under your auspicious conduct." Upon those grounds they asserted, respecting those equal rights of citizenship, "we expect the full extension of them from the justice of those states which still restrict them."

Besides the unjust and improper restrictions against Catholics, which yet are to be found in the constitutions of New Jersey and of North Carolina, and those of some of the New England states; the latter of which have been since repealed, the following were then the 12th and 13th sections of the constitution of South Carolina:

"12. No person shall be eligible to a seat in the Senate unless he be of the Protestant religion."

"13. No person shall be eligible to sit in the House of Representatives unless he be of the Protestant religion."

These have been repealed, and South Carolina at present, not only has the letter of her constitution, but the spirit of her legislature and of her other departments, kind, liberal, and just.

None had better opportunities of appreciating the conduct of the Catholics than General Washington possessed; and his answer to the address contains the following paragraph.

"As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community, are equally entitled to the protection of the civil government. I hope ever to see America amongst the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution, and the establishment of their government; or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

One of the Catholics who subscribed that address, and who received that answer, yet survives. Isolated in his grandeur, he raises his modest head amidst the graves of all his companions, linking together the past and the present generations; all the affections which we would transmit to the venerable fathers of our republics converge in him, and through him are conducted to them; well has his life been devoted to the practice

of virtue, nobly has his fortune been pledged for the benefits of myriads yet unborn; he has seen nearly a century pass away, and his honour is yet untarnished and sacred. And will America permit his departure to be embittered by the proclamation, that because of his profession and practice of the religion of the Alfreds, of the Augustines, of the Dorias, of the Tells, of the Ambroses, of the Fenelons, of the vindicators of Magna Charta, of the heralds of Christianity, of the discoveries of this continent; that, because he is a member of that church which preserved literature and civilized the world, the venerable Charles Carroll shall be classed with the most degraded portion of our sots by unappeasable and domineering bigotry? Yet, is not this the effort which is made?

Again, my friends, I call upon you to look to your Catholic neighbours; and ask—do they deserve such a stigma as this? It is true that few of their names are to be found upon the lists of what are called "temperance societies."—Yet it does not follow that they are intemperate. Others might have been actuated by the same motives which influenced him who addresses you, when he declined the invitation to enrol his name He never was, and trusts in God, that he never will be intemperate: but he declined, because he has occasionally found the use of distilled liquors in a very moderate quantity, to be very necessary, and even prescribed by respectable and temperate physicians; because more than once, his own life has, he believes, been saved by their use, as he has known others to have been lost by their abuse; because he believed that the regulations of those societies, though they might produce partial good, produced, he thought, a greater evil, in the hypocrisy of some, and the pride of others; and above all, because he found the association put forward by men, whom, on every occasion when there was a question of his religion, he found to be either grossly ignorant, incorrigibly obstinate, and superciliously insolent; or, if they were well-informed, were worse.

I believe, my friends, that for such reasons as these, few Catholics have joined or are likely to join these societies. I have also heard several members of other churches say, that they would not enter such associations; because they looked upon them to be, only means used for extending the influence, and upholding the power of what is intended to be a "religious party in politics."

But it will be said that this is not the ground upon which "Popery should be noticed in connexion with intemperance"—for the very essay itself is too plain to be misunderstood; it is the intrinsic baseness of Popery itself that places it on a level with intemperance; "for next to the fire which burns out reason and conscience, that power is to be

dreaded which stupifies conscience, and blinds understanding, and withholds the only light which can guide human reason aright, and makes the whole man a superstitious slave to the impositions of a crafty priesthood."

I believe I need take no trouble now to show that the object of the saints is to bring Catholics into contempt; for what can be more contemptible than a body whose consciences are stupified, whose understandings are blinded, and who are the superstitious slaves of a crafty and deceitful priesthood? Need I enter into any farther examination to show that the object is to deprive us of sympathy, to excite suspicion, and to subject us to distrust when we are exhibited as objects of dread? And who is the man that thus denounces not only half a million of his fellow-citizens, but the vast majority of the Christian world?

The denunciation is against the Roman Catholic Church, which numbers in its communion considerably upwards of one hundred and fifty millions of the civilized population of the globe. And by whom? By the mouth-piece of one of the smaller divisions of the modern separatists from the church of ages. I do not wish to write unkindly; I would not write offensively of any one of the religious societies which cover our territory; but it is necessary often to bring those who are ignorant or forgetful, to the contemplation of facts. If the doctrines of the Catholic Church stupify the conscience, how has it happened that the best works, for the direction of conscience, that are found amongst our separated brethren, who boast so much of their light, are garbled imitations of the Catholic writers, only deteriorated by their omissions? How has it happened that in the works of Catholic writers, before the unfortunate secession of Luther, all the great maxims of piety and morality are so conspicuous? How has it happened, that in the bosom of the Catholic Church they have been studiously preserved, zealously enforced, continually expounded, and nobly reduced to practice? It is true, that the Gersons, the Kempises, the Bourdaloues, the Fenelons, the Rodriguezes, the Granadas, the Francises of Sales, the Massillons, the Gothers, the Challoners, and men of that description, wrote in the plain and intelligible language of common sense, and of fervid piety, that whilst they enlightened the conscience, they did not shock the taste, nor disgust the understanding, though they won upon the heart. Their mode of stupifying the conscience was not indeed similar to that of the holy men who would sweep our church with their besom of destruction.

"When the soul finds corruption in itself, it sets to the rock Jesus Christ, and there repenting and believing, yea, by the highest actings of faith, endeavouring to knock off its beak, its individuate desires unto the world. A saint becomes clad

with the sun of righteousness, and presently the moon is under his feet; which makes him use the world, as though he used it not. A renewed old man, is a renewed eagle, enabled to mount in duties with the wings of eagles.''—*Lamot's Funeral Sermon* by Fulk Bellers, page 21.

''Ye know, dear saints, that the sweet-spirited nightingales, and robin red-breasts cannot endure cages, but will soon die; nor can precious souls be cooped up, or kept in durance under any form whatsoever, but they must be left free to fly up and down in Christian liberty.''—*Epistle* dedicated to John Rogers's *Bethshemesh*, page 47.

''For though truth be as good a diet as partridge, or pheasant, yet it is not to be served in or carved out raw, feathers and all; no, but cooked, and seasoned, and now and then you have a pretty tart sauce to it too, to whet your stomachs.—I pray accept of it, and say grace to it, and fall to, and much good may it do you.''—*Ib.* page 74.

''If you cannot reach a book off a shelf, you take a stool, and standing upon that stool, you are able to reach down the book; the stool are there gifts; grace alone, many times cannot reach down such a notion in divinity, as it is able to do by the help of gifts: gifts are given for the help of grace; they are the handmaids of grace, and they bring forth sweetly upon the knees of grace.''—Bridge's *Sermon before the Lord Mayor*, 1653, pages 49, 50.

''I do not boast, but I speak it to his glory, that God vouchsafed to take up his lodgings in so vile, so contemptible, unswept, ungarnished a room as this unworthy cottage of mine; but it was his will, and I am thankful for it.''—Cromwell's learned, devout, and conscientious exercise held at Sir Peter Temple's upon *Romans* xiii. 1. 1649, page 3.

''Let any true saint of God be taken away in the very act of any known sin, before it is possible for him to repent: I make no doubt or scruple of it but he shall be as surely saved as if he had lived to have repented of it.''—Prynn's *Perpetuity of a Regenerate Man's Estate*, page 431.

''The child of God in the power of grace doth perform every duty so well, that to ask pardon for failing either in the matter or manner of it, is a sin; it is unlawful to pray for forgiveness of sins after conversion; and if he does at any time fall, he can, by the power of grace, carry his sin to the Lord, and say, here I had it, and here I leave it.''—*Fifty Propositions taken from Brierly's Mouth*, proposition 19.

These, I acknowledge, are not the maxims by which the conscience of a Catholic is enlightened. He must be guided by the great rules of moral truth as revealed by God, and expounded and testified by the great bulk of the Christian world, in communion with the successor of that Apostle, to whom Christ declared, that upon that rock (Peter) would he build his church, against which the gates of hell should never prevail; that church founded and established in doctrine, after Christ, by the Apostles, upon whom the Holy Ghost descended, to lead them into all truth, and which truth was to continue for the guidance of the Christian people, as the pillar of the cloud and fire remained to bring Israel into the land of promise. The fervent, faithful disciples of the

early ages, the martyrs and their companions, gave to our predecessors the sacred volume which contains these maxims, together with the comment of their writings, and of their conduct. Scattered through thousands of churches, in every habitable portion of the globe, the zealous people preserved the deposit with religious fidelity under the powerful protection of the celestial influence. Occasionally, proud men, and sometimes weak men, at other times, corrupt men, went out from this body, censured for using novelties which could not be tolerated, because of their incompatibility with the original truth. The writings, the institutions, and the recorded conduct of those men who in their days were acknowledged to have comprehended and taught the true doctrine and practice revealed in the sacred volume, exhibited to the inquirer in the midst of the fluctuations of opinion, what was the correct rule for his conscience. What the Basils, the Gregorys, the Chrysostoms, the Augustines, the Ambroses, the Cyrils, the Jeromes, have taught from the sacred record, is that which guides the Roman Catholic to-day: this he prefers to the lucubrations, the conjectures, the anxieties, the experience, the backslidings, and the contradictions of "nightingales, and robin redbreasts," who wander to and fro in the full enjoyment of their powers of aberration.

And yet we are told by this religious writer that the vast majority of the Christian world, guided by such means in the exposition of the sacred text are "stupified in their consciences!!!" By whom has his been illustrated? He has had the spirit poured forth upon him. He has been a man of prayer, and he has been taught by heaven. I am ready to admit, that "could we see a spirit of prayer poured down upon us, I would not question but that God would open the bottles of his mercy and rain down upon us a blessing in abundance." (Sclater's sermon, Oct. 13, 1658, p. 60.) But the spirit of prayer and its form are two very different things. And it is not by saying, "Lord, Lord," but by doing the will of the Father, that man is to obtain a blessing. The will of the Father is, that we obey the Saviour, and the Saviour commanded us to hear that tribunal which he established, and whose ministers he sent with a commission to teach: he did not command us to destroy the tribunal, and first proclaiming unrestricted freedom under the pretext of unproved inspirations, then endeavour to subject others, under the semblance of an underived commission.

My friends, I have deviated from my plan in making this skirmish against the position that Catholics have their "consciences stupified." My object was not so much to combat the assertion, as to show the aim of the writer. I shall not therefore dwell at present upon the refutation

of his other charges. "That the understandings of Catholics are blinded," and that they are the "superstitious slaves of a crafty priesthood," as also the charge that this priesthood is guilty of "impositions." I shall merely ask upon what are these charges based?—It would seem from his article that the only reason he vouchsafes to give is, that the Catholic Church "withholds the only light which can guide human reason aright," by which I suppose he means the Bible. Assuming this to be the correct meaning of his piece, I shall curiously observe, that forbidding the use of a bad and defective translation of the book, is not "withholding the book:" nor is the forbidding its misinterpretation "withholding the book." This is all that the Catholic church does, and this, not only religion, but common sense and the public good would require. What he insinuates as a reason is then but a figment, and if he has no other proof of his charges, they are unsustained. His intention is manifest. It is to cast contempt upon the Catholics of the United States, to deprive them of the sympathy of their fellow-citizens, it is to excite against them sinister suspicions, and to prepare the mind of the community for ulterior steps in their regard.

My friends, "if by multiplying the streams and branches my stay may be a little longer than ordinary, I beforehand beg your pardon and patience, withal entreating the sharpening of your appetites, that you may eat of this pleasant fruit which grows upon these branches and drink of the waters of life which flow from these streams; and having your souls refreshed, I shall then dismiss you to that love feast which is prepared for your bodies."—Nat Hardy's *Sermon before the city of London, at their yearly feast in St. Paul.'s* May 27, 1658, page 3.

I have the honour to remain,
Very respectfully,
Yours, and so forth. B. C.

LETTER V

But to convince the proud what signs avail,
Or wonders move th' obdurate to relent?
They harden'd more by what might most reclaim,
Grieving to see his glory, at the sight
Took envy. *Milton.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 16, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—If you inquire what could be the ulterior objects which the editor of the *Southern Religious Telegraph* sought in bringing

Catholics into contempt and hatred: I will refer you to his own production for the answer. That production informs you of what I admit to be a fact; and I am gratified beyond measure at its development. The Catholics as they become better known, are more esteemed by their fellow-citizens. This is creditable to themselves, and to those by whom they are esteemed. In one it argues the absence of what deserves contempt or hatred; in the other, it shows the existence of a love of truth and of justice.

We have had ample evidence of the degradation of the Catholics in the United States at the period of the Revolution. They were sunk below the level of the negroes and of the Indians: few, poor, despised, a byword, butts of ridicule, objects of suspicion, victims of persecution, the mockery of school-boys, could they be sunk lower on the social scale? They had scarcely the skeleton of a clergy; and the greater portion of that little band consisted of men who had from their childhood been under the rod of affliction and trained up in a contentedness to neglect: they rejoiced that they were thought worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Christ. With scarcely an exception they were men who, though erudite, yet kept aloof from the learned, and, occupied in the discharge of their functions amongst their scattered poor, were only occasionally noticed by the public as strange objects of an undefined curiosity or of pity, or contempt, or of execration. The notions which the bulk of the citizens entertained of the doctrines of the Catholic church were the most preposterous: they were formed from the worst books of their most unprincipled opponents; from the allegations and preambles of the laws of their most bitter persecutors; from the tales of terrified old ladies, and the declamations of religious teachers, in whom, it is hard to determine whether gross ignorance of Catholic tenets, or fanatical hatred of everything Catholic predominated. The pulpit, the press, the bench, the bar, the public prejudice, the assemblies of the people, the representations of the theatre, the hall of the college, the lesson of the school, the tale of the nursery, whatever occupied the meditation of the sage, or guided the progress of the child, was all,—all, eminently and emphatically anti-Catholic. The Pope was the beast of the apocalypse, the church was the harlot who made the nations of the earth drunk with the cup of her abominations, Rome was the great custom-house of sin, at which a stipulated tariff was to be paid, for leave to commit with impunity, every crime by which man could be stained or God could be offended; incest, sodomy, murder, parricide might be perpetrated upon a trifling composition! Every Catholic was the sworn and devoted slave of the cruel tyrant who presided in this pest-house of abominations; an admirable

contrivance of wicked moral mechanism, enabled the monster to touch the springs by which his orders were secretly and securely and infallibly executed at the same moment, in a thousand places upon the surface of the globe, and by which he as infallibly learned all that occurred. The bishops confessed to him and received his directions; from these, he learned all that others had communicated to them, and through their agency, he conveyed his will to all his other vassals: each prelate stood in a similar relation to the priests, who were the conductors between him and the people: and all were to consider the Pope as the Lord God: his will could change virtue into vice, and make vice become virtue. The inquisitors also were his agents, who, by his command, destroyed in the most cruel manner, all who dared to question his omnipotence.

This tyrant looked upon kings as his slaves, and set his feet upon the necks of emperors; he abominated republicanism, and commanded the Bible to be destroyed. He lifted himself up in the temple of God against God himself, and substituted a gross and desolating superstition for the pure religion of the Apostles; a pageantry of corrupt and tawdry worldly pomp, for the observances of the meek and lowly Jesus. Every crime which was perpetrated under the semblance of religion, every political machination in which a Catholic was concerned, every suffering of a Protestant in a Catholic nation, for what crime soever, all were attributed to the ravening of this monster for human blood; real cruelties were aggravated, and imaginary atrocities were conjured up, and this revolting aggregate of everything vile and villanous was styled the religion of Roman Catholics!!! How the understanding is shocked, and the heart shudders, and charity recoils from the contemplation! Does not the question naturally present itself? If the American people had such notions of the religion of Roman Catholics, how could they tolerate an individual of that communion in the country? I shall not answer that question; but I bring two facts under your observation. 1. They did tolerate Catholics amongst them, and the general impression in their regard was such as I have imperfectly sketched. I will go farther, and say, such is the picture which the Evangelicals would give of us to-day; such is the notion honestly formed by a vast portion of our fellow-citizens at present. And 2. Not one single trait of the above picture is correctly drawn; no one of the features of the Catholic religion is there fairly or honestly represented. That which is now, unfortunately, the mistake of perhaps half our fellow-citizens, was, fifty years ago, the delusion of nearly the whole body.

Allow me to examine the intermediate history, that we may trace effects to their causes, and try to account for evangelical acrimony.

Subsequently to the Revolution there was, in the emigration hither, some accession of Catholics, though not speedily in great numbers. They were principally from Ireland and from Germany, and they at first settled more generally in Pennsylvania and Maryland, from various causes to which I need not advert; New York next received some accession, and only some stragglers found their way to the north or the south of this region. For a time their spiritual wants were but imperfectly, and only at intervals, supplied. Their conduct was open to the observation of their neighbours; they were persons generally of the humbler grades of society; they had been fully imbued with all the principles of the Catholic Church; the Irish had been exasperated and ground down by oppression and persecution; they felt partially relieved from the yoke which had so long pressed upon their fathers and themselves; and their feelings against Protestants were rather embittered than affectionate: they had here no "crafty priesthood" to teach them the concealment of their true principles, and to fit them with a mask of disguise; they were proverbially communicative, open, and confiding; in them an ordinary observer would soon detect the mark of the beast, and his true character would be easily developed. The Germans were blunt, rough, honest, and fully as open to observation as the Irish. The few clergymen of either nation who, from time to time, migrated hither, were equally subject to the public scrutiny as their flocks; and the Americans are not remarkable for their indifference or imperfection of observation.

From what I before stated, the public mind was not biassed favourably towards this portion of the new settlers. Yet it is a fact, that they gradually won upon the favour of their fellow-citizens, and after some time they were considered not only to be Christians, but even to be moral, and several of them pious; and some of their more reflecting neighbours began to hope, that though it would be prudent not to be over sanguine, yet it was possible they might become good citizens. Where they were more numerous, their intercourse with their fellow-citizens was necessarily more extended, and the opportunities for observation enlarged; and as this occurred, prejudice rapidly diminished.

Another accession was from France, at the period of her first revolution; and a large number of her clergy were thus thrown upon our shores. Nearly ignorant of our language, scarcely recovered from the terrors of the atrocities with which their infatuated and infuriated countrymen had disgraced the name of liberty, and smarting under the wounds inflicted upon them in the name of republicanism,—it would seem that these circumstances, superadded to the native deformities ascribed to Catholicism, would enable the cautious and inquisitive Amer-

ican to discover, in those men, the hideous traits of the Beast. Yet, they too improved upon acquaintance, were found useful to the country, exceedingly virtuous in their conduct, and affectionate to their neighbours. New England began to see a few Catholic emigrants settle only in her seaports, for as yet she had no manufactories; and the names of Matignon and Cheverus are affectionately recollected and pronounced with benediction by the sons of the Pilgrims. The insurrection of St. Domingo cast hundreds of refugees upon our southern coasts; a warm and cordial hospitality forgot the imagined abominations of their religion, they were observed, they were known, they were confided in, and yet they were Roman Catholics! The distresses of Ireland, and the love of America, brought out hordes, who spread over the face of our land. Louisiana was purchased and occupied, Missouri has grown into a state, and Florida belongs to us. In all our wide domain, the Catholics of these newly acquired regions and the Protestants of the old British colonies became blended together; they dwell in the same streets, they board in the same houses, they preside on the same bench, they serve on the same juries, they have defended their common country in the same ranks, their blood has been commingled in peace and in war. The Catholic clergy, as well as the Catholic laity, are under the eye of Protestant observation. Many very respectable persons who were ornaments of their own religious societies, have closely investigated the principles and the doctrines of the Catholic Church; they have laid aside their early prejudices, they have entered the pale of her communion; some of them minister at her altars, some of them are found in her cloisters, some of them are in the highest places of her esteem and confidence; they are themselves witnesses of her doctrines to their families, to their relatives, to their connexions, to their friends, and to their fellow-citizens.

In this manner, within the period of fifty years, have common sense, and common observation, and honest purpose, and Protestant intelligence, and Protestant honour, made a serious encroachment upon ancient Protestant prejudice, and folly, and injustice.

I have shown you the description of persons upon whom the scrutiny has been made. I beg of you now to see who have been the scrutineers? They are yourselves. They are the American people. I dislike sectional distinctions; but sometimes they may be inoffensively made. In making the inquiry which produced this result, we had first, the calm, steady, persevering industry of Pennsylvania, and the keen observation and jealous scrutiny of Maryland; we had the adverse, obstinate, determined investigation of New York; we had the prejudices of the

New Englander, deep-rooted and unbending, but yet loving truth, though cautious in the investigation. The New Englander has a character, many of the features of which I admire; and dare I venture upon a prophetic calculation, I would say, that the land of steady habits will, before the lapse of half a century, be a land in which the Catholic Church will extensively flourish! Add to these the high-toned feeling of the South, with its high-toned attachment to its high church principles, which, though it would scarcely vouchsafe an examination of our creed, yet is most jealous and lynx-eyed as to the effect of our doctrines upon society. Yes, my friends! it is by you,—by a people of strong and varied prejudices against us, but a people of the most comprehensive mind, the most habitual jealousy, and probably, as an aggregate, the best instructed in the universe, that, during half a century, this scrutiny has been made; the result of which is a decision, to a great degree, in our favour. We duly appreciate the kindness, and we are gratified for the benefit,—though, as yet, it renders us only partial justice.

My friends, it is this decision of yours which has enraged the evangelicals, and driven them to assail us. The writer in the *Telegraph* complains, 1. That you regard our efforts with more complacency and delight, than you do any enterprise of theirs. It is true, that our efforts are not directed to create a Christian party in politics; and though we do count half a million of what they are pleased to call "subjects of the Beast," we are not found plotting, as the Reverend Doctor Ely testifies against his own party, to establish "sentiments which no man but an infidel need blush to avow," and from which, of course, a saint will not depart. The propriety and the certainty of bringing a combined religious club of half a million of votes to the polls on a given day, for a given purpose. Were we to make such an effort as this, you would not, and you ought not to regard it with complacency. Our efforts are made to diffuse learning, by the means of schools and colleges, to erect churches, and to create pastors for our destitute flocks,—to introduce the correct knowledge of our peculiar principles and practices amongst our fellow-citizens, for the purpose of disabusing them of the unfounded prejudices under which they have laboured, we trust, without any fault of their own. Our efforts are openly directed to these, and only to these objects. We do not calumniate our brethren, we do not "nickname God's creatures," we do not excite hatred against our fellow-citizens, we do not sow discord in the Union, nor do we, with a Pharisaic rudeness, send our deacons to drag ladies from carriages, under the pretext of serving the God of benevolence.

2. The writer complains that you have more sympathy for us than

you have for any denomination of "enlightened Christians" in the land. This does honour to your feelings. For who is deserving of sympathy, if it be not the victim of bigotry and of misrepresentation? You have seen that such is the state to which we have been reduced. The "enlightened Christians," to whatever denomination they may belong, need not your sympathy. Were they in our situation, and we in theirs, we trust they should receive not only our sympathy, but also our aid. When the British dissenters were under the operation of the British test-act, the Roman Catholics uniformly petitioned on their behalf, though the evangelical section of the dissenters uniformly petitioned against Catholic emancipation, and for the emancipation of negroes. Thank God, the "enlightened Christians of other denominations" do not need your sympathy, but we do; and we thank you for it, though you are called "anti-Christian moralists," probably from your sympathy for the poor slaves of Antichrist, as we are said to be. Yet we warn you to be cautious, for you are told "that the monster is forging chains to bind you." Lest you should doubt my accuracy, I shall again bring the passage to your view."

"Already 'the Beast' numbers half a million of subjects in these United States. And the morality and practices of this communion accord so well with the views and feelings of thousands of the descendants of Protestants, who cannot endure the 'bigoted rules' of Presbyterians, that the industrious efforts of the minions of the Pope to extend his authority in our land, are regarded with more complacency and delight than any enterprise in which Christians have engaged to diffuse the light and influence of the Gospel. Yes, it is well known that the anti-Christian moralists of our times have more sympathy for the monster that is forging chains to bind them, than they have for any denomination of enlightened Christians in the land. And here the danger is the more imminent, because it is unseen. The tolerant friends of Popery, who seem to regard it as differing little from the religion of the Bible, or of Protestants, and the indifferent spectators, know not its influence, and so forth."

Here, then, those "thousands," the writer might have substituted "millions" of the descendants of Protestants, who cannot endure the "bigoted rules" of Presbyterians, are complimented with the appellation of "anti-Christian moralists." We are thus nicknamed, in company with the largest and most respectable portion of our fellow-citizens, to whom this wanton insult has been arrogantly given, because they do not choose to submit to the discipline of those men, who aspire to the first places in the synagogues, to be saluted in the market-places, and to be called rabbi by their fellow-men: and also, because, after half a century of close scrutiny, they cannot find that we are such miscreants as the saints of former ages proclaimed us to be. It worries the holy ones of the present day that you, my friends, "the tolerant friends of Popery, seem to regard it as little differing from the religion of the

Bible." Would they exhort you to be like themselves, intolerant? After proclaiming that it is the right of every human being, man, woman, and child, to judge without dictation or appeal, of the meaning of every passage of the Bible, will they presume to deprive you of that right? Or, are you to take from this comparatively insignificant subdivision of a minority of Christendom, an interpretation, the right of giving which they deny to the vast, the overwhelming majority? Are they able to assure you that they have the genuine and original meaning of the sacred volume, and that it has been lost by the great body which has substituted in every age, and been spread through all nations? Are you not as competent as they are, to judge of the true meaning of the Bible? Is not your understanding as good as theirs? Have not your opportunities of knowing our doctrine been equally extensive; have you not been as free from prejudice, and as anxious to discover truth as they? Why then will they presume to arraign your opinion, that our religion differs little from the religion of the Bible? Are we not equally competent as either you or they to read that sacred volume, to judge of its contents, and to compare it with our tenets? We have received from the same God equal portions of intellect as they have, our education has been equally good as theirs, or yours, our knowledge of our own doctrines is at least equally accurate; and, after due comparison of both, we say that our doctrine does not differ even little, or at all, from the religion of the Bible; and upon what ground will those men presume to set their judgment above ours? In flinging this insult upon us, do they not offend you? Or, must you and we be compelled to learn from them the religion of the Bible? Is this their notion of Christian liberty? What has become of the "sweet-spirited nightingales and robin redbreasts" of the days of yore? Is the freedom of every man to interpret the Bible according to the dictates of his private judgment, to be restricted by the priviso, that he must discover in it what is called evangelical religion, or, as the writer expresses it, "the 'bigoted rules' of the Presbyterians?" Because your deliberate judgments have, after close observation, and cautious inquiry and mature reflection, acquitted us of the foul charges made against us by the saints of former days, you too are abused and vilified by these self-sufficient men.

But, my friends, you do not stand alone in bearing this testimony in our favour. Our religion was calumniated and persecuted in Great Britain: and after having been there also subjected to the most trying ordeal of examination, after enduring the repeated test of the parliamentary rack, after answering the varied charges of every bigot, put in every form; after combating the assaults of every defamer, after refer-

ences to our universities, the explanations of our prelates, the inspection of our colleges, the dissection of our institutions: notwithstanding the great weight of clerical opposition, the monitions of the lords-spiritual, the wailings of the evangelicals, the denunciations of the Bible societies, the homilies of the societies for discountenancing vice, the sighs of the meek, the threats of the strong, the terrors of old maids, and the prognostication of old men, Great Britain has laid down her prejudices, broken the bonds of her iniquity, and proclaimed the emptiness of the pretexts and the wickedness of the enactments, by whose means our religion was misrepresented, and our people were ground down. The liberal Protestants of Great Britain and of America have then passed a just judgment in our favour: and this is gall and wormwood to the evangelicals. It is, therefore, that "the tolerant friends of Popery" are styled "anti-Christian moralists," by those intolerant men. Yes, my friends, "you have examined our principles of morality and the practices of our communion:" and these men truly say, "that they so well accord with the views and feelings of thousands of the descendants of Protestants," that, in their estimation, they "differ little from the religion of the Bible;" and they therefore not only do not hate us, but they regard "our industrious efforts with comparative complacency." We are deeply grateful to those tolerant friends who bear such honourable testimony in our regard; and we are happy to know that they are numerous and increasing. To their kindness, to the excellence of our cause, and to the blessing of Heaven, but not to the charity, the forbearance, or "sweet spirit" of the men of "bitter sanctity," do we commit ourselves.

I could give you volumes of extracts from the periodicals of the day, to sustain the position which I have taken; but why perform this work of supererogation? You cannot doubt its correctness. I shall conclude this letter by giving you an extract from a number of the *Boston Recorder*, in the beginning of last January. It is comparatively mild and tolerant: has some little decency.

"ROMAN CATHOLICS.

"The *Pawtucket Chronicle* of the 19th ultimo expresses joy that the Roman Catholic chapel of that village was completed, and would be opened for High Mass on Christmas day. 'For our own part (observe the editors) we are Protestants, born and educated in a Protestant country; yet we do sincerely believe that the Catholic cross and the Protestant spire point upward to the same heaven.'

"Their remark is latitudinarian enough; and the full amount of their Protestantism, like that of some other editors, who act as apologists of Popery, seems to consist in their being 'born and educated in a Protestant country.' As the friends of religion and civil liberty, we ought to support the doctrine of free toleration, and

be willing to defend the religious rights of those whose tenets are the most absurd and corrupt; but it is no mark of knowledge or correct religious feeling, to express pleasure in Popery. It would be well for our Protestant editors, who are so complacent towards 'the mother of harlots,' to be well acquainted with the principles and history of Popery, and its demoralizing tendency, before they rejoice in its progress in our land of light and liberty. 'The Protestant,' a new paper contemplated by Mr. Requa, of New York, will, it is hoped, furnish our country with the wished-for information.''

Thus it is not only hatred to Catholics, but censure of liberal Protestants, which characterizes the holy associates.

Yours, respectfully, B. C.

LETTER VI

Learn hence for ancient rules a just esteem;
To copy nature is to copy them.

Pope.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 22, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—I have been admonished to make my present letter very short, or to omit addressing you this week, as the pages of the Miscellany are engaged for a communication, to whose author I am bound to pay a willing homage. As I do not wish to omit my weekly epistle, I must then be brief.

I have, in my last, shown you with what justice and kindness we have been treated by a large portion of our Protestant fellow-citizens, and how their good conduct displeased our opponents. I shall now follow up the topic, so as to conclude my remarks upon the paragraph which I then took for examination. The editor of the *Southern Religious Telegraph* endeavours to account for the favour which we have received from Protestants, upon the ground of their ignorance or their stupidity.

''The tolerant friends of Popery, who seem to regard it as differing little from the religion of the Bible, or of Protestants, and the indifferent spectators, know not its influence, its power to excite the imagination, captivate the senses, and enslave the mind to forms of superstition, while no truth is brought to bear on the conscience or the heart.''

Allow me to discuss this pretty paragraph. Protestants and other tolerant, that is, indifferent spectators, are said to be ignorant of the following facts: first, that Popery has influence by its power to excite the imgaination; secondly, that it has influence by its power to captivate the senses; thirdly, that it has influence to enslave the mind to the forms of superstition; and, fourthly, that all this is done, whilst no truth is brought to bear on the conscience or the heart.

To sustain these four propositions, not one tittle of evidence is adduced. I shall, however, admit the two first to be perfectly true, and deny that there exists a particle of truth in either of the two last; and, as to sustain the editor's position would require the combined truth of the entire, especially as derived from the correctness of his fourth proposition, which is notoriously untrue; of course that position is utterly untenable.

I am not bound to prove my negatives: but, by every rule of reason, he ought to make, at least, a *prima facie* case, before I could be called upon for a defence; but I waive formalities. If the Catholic religion does not, by her ceremonial, excite the imagination to an excessive and disorderly pitch, nor mislead it from facts to fancies, it does no injury; but, if it so excites the imagination, as to aid the memory in the recollection of important facts, and their proper bearing, this is useful to devotion: and such is truly the case.

The holy society of evangelicals, whose interpreter the editor appears to be, frequently lament the want of this excitement, in what they call formal religionists; but revivals, outpourings of the spirit, rhapsody, conviction, experience, the triumph of grace, the apprehension of the Lord, the enthusiasm flowing from the imagined certainty of election and predestination; this undoubting faith, as it is called; all this excitement of the imagination is, according to the sanctimonious fraternity, the discovery of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus; and yet, they talk of the excitement of the imagination by Popery! Verily, and of a truth, there are more of such imaginings at one revival, or camp-meeting, than would suffice for ten provinces of Popery. I cannot consent, unless driven thereto, to enter into disgusting and ridiculous details, of which, if the brethren choose, they shall have abundance.

The imagination of the Catholic is rationally excited by the representation of the great facts of religion, created in painting, or statuary, and exhibited in ceremony; thus also Popery captivates the senses, but for what purpose? To excite the recollection of those facts which are recorded in the Bible; to place before us the example of the faithful servants of God; and, in doing so, we have the warrant of God's own precept, and of his own example. We have it not only in the precepts which he gave to Moses respecting the ark, and its decorations and appurtenances, but also in the model of the work which he exhibited upon the mountain; in the brazen serpent, that he caused to be made and exposed; until it became an occasion of scandal, which rendered its removal necessary. I need not here multiply the proofs, by reference to the works of Solomon, of Nehemias, and of others. I need not refer

to the raising up memorials of the passage of the Jordan, and of the sustenance of the people in the desert. All these captivated the senses, excited the imagination, wrought upon the memory, and thereby led to the practice of religion; and, as regards ceremony, surely we have the authority of God himself, for the costly and ornamental and mystic attire of the priesthood, and of the attendants in the temple, for the symbolic rites of the Egyptian lamb, the feast of Tabernacles, the celebration of Pentecost, and several others. All these are calculated to captivate the senses, to excite the imagination, and thus influence man for the purposes of religion.

But the writer says that "Popery enslaves the mind to the forms of superstition." He does not vouchsafe either to inform us what he means by superstition; what are those forms, nor the mode of the enslavement. Thus his charge is so indistinct that it is not susceptible of distinct refutation. But my friends, I shall inform you what we mean by superstition. It is the use of any rite or ceremony, or other means, with the expectation of thereby obtaining any spiritual or supernatural effect, not attached thereto by the nature of what we so use, or by the institution of God. When he shall be able to show that any one of our authorized practices comes under this definition, then I shall admit that it is superstitious. Our authorized decorations and ceremonies are all calculated to impress the mind with the idea of God's presence, his perfections, the homage which we owe to him, the benefits which he has conferred upon us, and the gratitude which we ought to exhibit in return. If this be superstition, we plead guilty. If this be religion, we claim to be religious. We first produce the definition; until this be admitted or denied, it would be ridiculous to go into special facts: but if the principle be agreed to, let our adversaries then go through the catalogue of our practices, and we shall abide the results of the application of that description to each. If abiding by the principles of religion be an enslavement of the mind, then are we enslaved. If it be the freedom of the children of God, then are we free. Thus his third proposition is untrue.

His fourth is utterly destitute of even a semblance of truth. He charges us that in our system "no truth is brought to bear upon the conscience or the heart." I am perfectly well aware of the influence of prejudice upon every mind. I can therefore suppose that this man actually thinks as he writes, and that he is under the erroneous impression that ours is a mere external exhibition of unmeaning and empty pomp. My friends, the fact is quite otherwise. In all our ceremonial, there is not one particle of mere idle exhibition. It is true that, like the

language of the nation, the symbolic rite which our church thus uses, is unintelligible to a stranger, until he is taught. But they who conclude that it is useless, or unmeaning show, may be well compared to the person who upon arriving in a strange country, imagined its population were all idiots, and would fain persuade his companions that they used unmeaning and ridiculous babbling, instead of language; he was certain that they could not understand each other, because they were incomprehensible to him. One of his associates, however, who had travelled more, soon contrived to learn some of the phrases, and understand their meaning, but could not make his obstinate friend recede from his first notions; though his associate showed himself now able to hold some intercourse with the natives, and declared that as his knowledge of their vocabulary became extended, he was delighted with the copiousness of their tongue, and the rich significancy of their phraseology.

I have known several respectable converts to our faith, whose devotion was wonderfully increased, and whose piety was greatly soothed by the rich, and sublime, and varied language of our ceremonial, as soon as they became acquainted with the principles of its explanation. When they spoke to some of their friends upon the subject, in the warm language of their new feelings, their expressions were attributed to unmeaning fanaticism; for the persons whom they addressed perceived no change: the language was as yet unintelligible to them. So I should suppose ours is to the editor of the Southern Telegraph. But such is not our own case. In it we behold, compendiously, and strikingly displayed, the fall and the imperfection of man; the promise and the expectation of a redeemer; the inefficiency of the ancient institutions for the purposes of our redemption; the types of better things; the arrival of the Saviour; the promulgation of his Gospel; its effects; the institutions of the Saviour; his death, the source of their efficacy, the ground of our hope; the lessons of morality, which we should practice: the approach of death; the examples of the saints; the rewards bestowed upon them by a merciful God: and we are excited to labour as they did, that through the merits of the same Saviour, we may obtain similar glory. Is not this bringing truth to bear upon the conscience and the heart? I would now ask whether the ignorance is chargeable upon the tolerant Protestant, who in his worship perceives little that differs from the religion of the Bible, or upon the bigoted, or if he prefers it, the intolerant Protestant, who calls it "an enslavement of the mind to forms of superstition, while no truth is brought to bear upon the conscience or the heart?"

It is a notorious fact that even upon the uninstructed, the forms

of our religion are calculated to make an impression which better fits the mind for the recollection of divine truth, the contemplation of heavenly things, and the reverential payment of homage to the eternal God. Upon this I may confidently appeal to any person who has had the opportunity of witnessing them duly performed, and who has attended with an unprejudiced disposition. How often has the subdued demeanour, the solemn attention, and occasionally the moistened eye of the stranger, testified the feeling? I recollect two instances, in different stations of life, in which the same feeling was expressed in different style. An English gentleman asked his footman, a Protestant, who accompanied him to a High Mass, in Brussels, what he thought of the ceremony. He answered, "Sir, I never saw God Almighty served like a gentleman before." One of the most talented and observant British diplomatists observed, after attending at a High Mass, celebrated by the Archbishop of Paris, in Norte Dame—"If I were king of France, I would permit no subject to elevate the host: that sublime act should be performed only by myself." Did our Protestant fellow-citizens take more pains to understand what is thoughtlessly condemned their information, and our mutual charity, would be increased.

Yours respectfully, B. C.

LETTER VII

> O let me live,
> And all the secrets of our camp I'll show;
> Their force, their purposes: nay I'll speak that
> Which you will wonder at.
>
> *Shakespeare.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 29, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—Before I proceed to examine the charges which the editor of the *Southern Religious Telegraph* has made upon the Roman Catholic body, and to exhibit their utter want of foundation; allow me to draw your attention to a very unfortunate assertion, which, in his essay, follows the little paragraph upon which I commented in my last letter. Complaining of the stupidity of liberal Protestants or, as he calls them, the tolerant friends of Popery, he states:—

"Nor do they appear to know the fact, which is demonstrated by the whole history of Popery, that civil and religious liberty, as understood in this country, the last half century, cannot co-exist with the laws of the papal communion. If the latter are administered, liberty must die—from the nature of things it is impossible for them to flourish together."

Was ever writer more unfortunate? With notorious facts, palpably under his observation; it would seem that he not only cannot perceive the existence of what he announces, but he asserts the impossibility of what he proclaims to be a fact.

He surely will not deny that "civil and religious liberty, as understood in this country the last half century," has during that half century been in a flourishing and prosperous state: he anticipates evils it is true, but they have not as yet arrived, and as they might be only imaginary, he cannot assume the possibilities dreaded by his imagination, to be really in existence. We have then hitherto preserved civil and religious liberty, and it has as yet been well upheld. This is an unquestionable fact. Now another fact equally unquestionable, is, that the Roman Catholic religion has, during the same period, made an astonishing progress in our republics, and there is not in all Christendom, a country in which "the laws of the papal communion," as he calls the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, have less impediment cast in the way of their administration, [12] by the civil government, than amongst us. And these laws are effectually carried into full execution. It is therefore evident that civil and religious liberty, such as he designates, and our religion, have actually co-existed and flourished together. Fifty years ago our republics were by no means secure: they were certainly not prosperous. To-day they are strong, powerful, efficient, formidable, happy, and respected. Fifty years ago, there was not a diocess, a bishop, a seminary, nor a convent of the Catholic church in our Union. Now there is a perfect province, with its regular hierarchy, consisting of an

[12] The student of political economy discovers a striking similarity between the American system and the method of procedure adopted by the Roman Court. The Pope is, no more than is the President of the United States, an absolute despotic ruler. He is the Vicar of Christ, holds his power from Christ, and is responsible to Christ for the exercise of that power. In his official capacity, he has duties the most solemn and serious, ever laid on the shoulders of human being. These duties are fixed as restricting elements, and are, clearly and unchangeably determined by the fact of divine revelation, by the positive ordinances of Christ, and by the mission essentially involved in the divine institution of the Church. Where the Word of God and the divine character of the Church are concerned, the Pope is not free. In the exercise of the pontifical power, the Pope attends unto the decrees of general councils the enactments of the Canon Law, and the force of precedent. He has his Cabinet, the College of Cardinals, and seldom determines anything against their advice. Examining the manner in which the affairs of the Catholic Church are administered, we are forcibly reminded of our President and his Cabinet. The various Congregations of Cardinals correspond to the different executive departments at Washington—to the State department, the War department, the Interior department, and the other departments representative of the President, the chief Executive. Before the Papal Cabinet, the affairs of the body Catholic are brought, and these affairs are discussed with all the patience and ability demanded by interests that are eternal. In the practical government of the Church, many striking features peculiar to Democracy are fully recognized.—Ed.

archbishop, with seven suffragan bishops, and two coadjutors, besides two exempt diocesses and their bishops; giving an aggregate of twelve of the episcopal body, with their secular clergy: two universities, and five or six seminaries: a province of Jesuits with an university and noviciate, and two or three colleges: an establishment of Sulpicians, with an university and college, and a seminary; a province of Dominican friars, with their professed house and college, and noviciate; two or three establishments of Lazarists with their colleges and seminaries and schools; an establishment of Augustinian friars; two flourishing Ursuline convents, Visitation nuns, Carmelite nuns, poor Clares, Lorretines, Sisters of Charity, and five or six other descriptions of female religious societies, with their schools and establishments, besides some monasteries of men. Add to this, three or four periodical presses, and continual demand for new churches, and more clergymen: the progress of the religion appearing to be in the ratio of the efforts to extinguish it or to impede its progress. The editor himself saw this, and complained of the very increase; and tells his readers that Popery has invaded the land, "is laying the foundations of an empire," "is forging chains to bind the anti-Christian moralists," and so on. Yet this writer, who observes and testifies the existence of this liberty, and this Popery, who has beheld the wonderful progress of each in the same land, and under the same government, very sapiently assures his readers, verily, and of truth, that they "cannot co-exist"—"from the nature of things it is impossible for them to flourish together." And he very wisely gives us the assurance of this impossibility, whilst he assures us, that what he declares to be impossible is the fact! Which are we to believe, his doctrine, or his testimony?—"If the laws of the papal communion be administered, liberty must die." But the said laws have been administered during half a century, and yet liberty has not died. [13]

Perhaps he has discovered that she is in her death sickness, for the administration of the law of the papal communion must be the tariff: and the death sickness is evidently nullification! Bless us! what a glorious privilege it is, to be gifted with the power of looking into the imaginary world, and proclaiming the solution of those enigmas, which,

[13] The Catholic Church, by her intrinsic constitution, tends to the defence of the American Republic. Down to 1776, every republic that existed in Christian times owed a debt to Catholicity. The republics of Switzerland, Venice, Genoa, Andorra, San Marino, and a host of minor free commonwealths, stand in history as unanswerable evidences of Catholic devotion to government by the people, of the people, and for the people. Trials by jury, habeas corpus, stationary courts, and the law that taxes are not to be levied without the free consent of those who pay them—those great, free principles which lie at the basis of the American constitution—originated in an age centuries prior to the religious revolution of the 16th century.—Ed.

are so impervious to ken of ordinary mortals! Now which of us, poor creatures, whose nations are confined to the surface of the globe, could have suspected that our civil and religious liberties had been so greatly jeopardized by the administration of the laws of the papal communion? Sure enough! there was a provincial council in Baltimore, nearly two years ago; the Pope has confirmed the proceedings of the prelates; the president has dismissed his cabinet, some of those who lost their places, are very angry; the vice-president and Mr. Crawford, are at open war; South Carolina is about to do strange things, and we have a popish attorney-general! No wonder that the sun gave dim portent of mighty disasters! But even previous to his ghastly green and livid blue, the prognostication was drawn from a more unerring horoscope, by the sagacious editor of the *Southern Religious Telegraph*! "If you cannot reach a book off a shelf, you take a stool, and standing upon that stool, you are able to reach down the book; the stool are these gifts; grace alone, many times cannot reach down such a notion in divinity as it is able to do by the help of gifts, and so forth." Verily, it is a good gift, to be able to reconcile contradictions! This is a favour granted only to the elect.

Passing by this paragraph, without further remarks, for the present, allow me to exhibit to you the arrogance with which this evangelical editor treats the tolerant friends of Popery, as he is pleased to call the liberal Protestants of the United States. After degrading Roman Catholics to the level of the drunkard, the profane swearer, the gambler, the votary of dissipation, the infidel, and the anti-Christian, and emphatically designating them as the slaves of the impositions of a crafty priesthood, as the subjects of a beast, he compliments all those Protestants who do not choose to adopt the rules of the Presbyterians, with the assurance that their feelings and views accord perfectly well with the morality and practices of the abominable outcasts whom he has thus described! This is a compliment for which the large portion of the Protestants should feel very grateful. This is a species of liberality that ought to make a due impression upon them. It reminds me of the manner in which a stupid fellow once made his court to a person with whom he sought an intimacy. "My dear sir, I had a cousin of whom I was very fond; we were exceedingly intimate, and I was greatly attached to the poor fellow. He was one of the most jovial, merry scapegraces I ever knew; he lived in a continual round of gambling, dissipation, and their comcomitant habits; until in an unlucky moment he had his career arrested—poor fellow! You knew him; he was hanged last year. Your manner and appearance remind me so perfectly of

him, that I have ever since sought to make your acquaintance—for really I feel at a loss for a companion!'' It is quite out of the question, my friends, to doubt the great respect in which the evangelical brethren hold their fellow-Protestants, the unconverted, the unregenerated, the worldly! Nor is this a novel feeling amongst the pure and the orthodox in regard to the other portion; the tolerant, and the liberal; and not only in their regard, but towards all those who have fallen short of their notions of reformation and holy hatred of our church. I shall give you a few specimens.

''The church of England is a true whorish mother, and they that were of her, were base begotten, and bastardly children, and she neither is, nor ever was truly married, joined, or united unto Jesus Christ, in that espoused band, which his true churches are and ought to be.''—Lilburn, cited by Bastwick.

''Of all the nations that have renounced the whore of Rome, there is none in the world so far out of square as England, in retaining the Popish Hierarchy.''—*Epistle before the Demons.*

''Your churches bear with drunkards, whoremongers, railers, open scorners at godliness. The most ungodly of the land, are the forwardest for your ways. You may have almost all the drunkards, blasphemers, and ignorant haters of godliness to vote for ye.''—Baxter, *Dispute* V., pages, 17, 37.

''The church of England evidently declares themselves limbs of Antichrist: therefore, there is no communion to be kept with such in their public worship.''—*Vind. Cult. Evang.*, page 30.

''We have a long while been clouded by confusion in the church by a loose priesthood, who have not only brought in an innumerable number of pagan rites, and Jewish ceremonies, but by their hellish skill have just broke through our constitution and almost reduced her to the obedience of Rome.''—*Rebels Doom*, page 42.

''What can a man of sense believe when he shall see a priest at the altar, acting a holy part, bowing, and cringing, approaching the bread and wine, as if the popish notion of transubstantiation was true?''—*Christianity no Creature of the State*, page 13.

''If we look upon the lives, actions, and manners of the priests and prelates of this age, and see their pride, impudency, profaneness, uncleanliness, one would think that hell had broke loose and that the devils in surplices, in hoods, and copes, and rochetts, and in foursquare . . . . upon their heads[14] were coming amongst us . . . . The priests are *secundum ordinem diaboli*, a generation of vipers, proud, ungrateful, illiterate asses.''—Nelson's *Collect*, V. 1, page 502, 3.

''The bishops are men swallowed up with wine and strong drink, whose tables are full of vomit and filthiness, whoremongers and adulterers, who as fed horses neigh after their neighbours' wives.'' The rest of this passage is too obscene.—White's *First Century.* Preface.

''One parson is drunken and quarrelsome, but then he bows to the altar and thinks King William is damned. Another cheats everybody, and pays nobody, but he drinks to the royal orphan, and cannot abide King George. A third neither preaches

[14] The clergy of the church of England at the period of this publication used to wear square caps, such as are still worn in the English universities.—I. A. R.

nor prays, but he does a more meritorious thing, he constantly and fervently curses the Germans and the Presbyterians. A sixth is an evidence upon a trial and forswears himself, but the cause was for tithe, and he did it out of love for the church. A seventh is a scoffer, who has laughed religion out of the world, but he hated my lord Wharton like a toad, and got drunk frequently with Lord Harry for the prosperity of the church.''—*Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, page 15, 16.

These, and volumes of such passages, which abound in the publications of the saints, during the last two centuries, show their feelings towards other Protestants, and the estimation in which they hold all that do not come up to their standard of purity, and orthodoxy, and illiberality. Thus it is that the sanctified editor styles the other Protestants, anti-Christian moralists, in contra-distinction to evangelical Christians, who are the Puritans of our day. He charges them with cherishing sympathy rather for gross error than for enlightened Christianity: and with stupidity and ignorance in not knowing the evil tendency of Popery, both upon the spiritual and political concerns of the community and of the nation! ! ! This is the politeness, this the courtesy, this the forbearance with which the charitable editor treats the large mass of the Protestant population of America! What could an unfortunate Catholic expect from such a man, or from the host to which he belongs, when he is thus insulting and arrogant to the great body of the Protestants who profess to be reformed without professing to be evangelical?

Let us now review his specific charges against the subjects of the Beast. He places as the caption of his article—*The Republic in Danger!* He then repeats in the very commencement of his article that ''it ought not to be concealed, that the republic is in danger;'' he assures his readers that it is ''a dream of the imagination'' to suppose that ''increasing numbers and growing prosperity, are evidences of the safety of the republic, and pledges of its perpetuity.'' On the contrary he declares that this ''dream of the imagination so fondly entertained, instead of diminishing, increases the danger to which it is exposed.'' Again, to make assurance doubly sure; to perform his duty as a watchman upon the tower, he ceases not to repeat ''whatever good citizens may imagine, there is danger.'' Of a verity, then, if the slumbering and careless ''good citizens,'' indulge in their imaginations and their day-dreams; the watchman hath loudly proclaimed—he hath delivered his own soul. But, pray, faithful sentinel!—what is it you behold! Why such an aspect of terror! Why shake you so? Does any treacherous foe invade the peaceful bosom of our land?

Frighting her pale-faced villages with war?

''The republic is invaded by enemies that are plotting its destruc-

tion, more numerous and more powerful than the hostile armies of '76." But, good friend, you must be under a mistake. Your eyes are weary from watching, or your imagination is excited from apprehension and vigilance; we perceive no enemy—we see no danger. Yea, now, is not this deplorable? "And what renders the condition of the republic more hazardous is the fact that the assaults of the enemy are so insidious that they are not generally observed by the people." But, friend, we really know not what bewilders and terrifies you. You acknowledge, as facts, 1, that our numbers increase; 2, that our prosperity grows; and 3, that the people cannot observe, and do not feel or perceive those assaults that you speak of. Are you not ashamed to make false alarms? or are you demented? Demented! wo be to the mockers: "Let good citizens look around them—we would give no false alarm—let them look at the encampment of the enemy, and see the hostile powers arrayed against the republic, and they will be convinced that the present is not the time to dream that all is safe." Really, sir, we have looked around us, and the only encampments that we can perceive are those for religious meetings of the Methodists and the Presbyterians, with a few, occasionally, of the Baptists. In these there undoubtedly is mighty bustle, there is fearful noise, but we cannot perceive that they are "hostile powers arrayed against the republic." Pray, sir, do you call these enemies? Is it to disperse these congregations; is it to send the men to their labours and the women to their household concerns, that you have told us that we should cry "To arms!" "to arms?" Is it for this purpose you proclaim that "the cry" should be "reiterated in every part of the republic?" Is it for this that you declare "the whole people should have risen *en masse*?" We assure you, sir, that to us no other camp is visible, save those religious camps: although we look upon them as not useful, either to religion, or morality, or the state, yet we do not think ourselves warranted to interfere with the rights of those who bellow or who rave, with the liberties of those who are frantic or sober, of those who feast or who fast, with the conduct of the man of prayer, or of him of blasphemy, who might be found in this multitude. Wo to the careless; wo to the unbeliever! Wo to him who would compare the host of Israel to the Philistine! the armies of Jehovah to the invader. "Do you not see that Popery has invaded the land, and is laying the foundations of an empire with which, if it prevail, the enlightened freedom of the republic cannot exist?" So, so; is this the enemy? Is this the camp? Is this the hostile array? O! now I begin to breathe more freely. Why, sir, all these tropes, and figures, and hyperbolical expressions, led me to fear that really there

was some danger; and especially when they were uttered by you. I could never have imagined that a gentleman of such well-regulated gravity, such holy calmness, so demure an aspect, so staid and measured a gait, so plain as to the exterior man, and so sober-minded as respects the interior man, could make so vehement on outcry, and permit his imagination to be so irrecoverably bewildered in metaphor. I assuredly believed you were describing what your corporeal eye discovered. Which of these are you?

> Lovers and madmen have such seething brains,
> Such shaping fantasies, that apprehend
> More than cool reason ever comprehends.
> The lunatic, the lover, and the poet,
> Are of imagination all compact.
> One sees more devils than vast hell can hold;
> That is the madman: the lover, all as frantic,
> Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt;
> The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
> Doth glance from heav'n to earth, from earth to heaven;
> And, as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name.
> Such tricks hath strong imagination,
> That if it would but apprehend some joy,
> It comprehends some bringer of that joy;
> Or in the night, imagining some fear,
> How easy is a bush supposed a bear?

My friends, excuse me, if I have thus relaxed my style whilst I perused my subject. I thought this colloquial criticism best calculated to expose the perfect folly of the paragraphist's apprehensions: whether, deluded by his own imagination, he really entertained them, or conscious of the absence of any foundation upon which they could solidly rest, he conjured up its semblance in the phraseology of terror. The Italians have a proverb which well describes this latter procedure. It represents a blacksmith running hastily, having a serious air of business, with a piece of cold iron in his tongs; he plunges it into the water from which a heated piece had just been removed, and over which the vapour yet rests; whilst he cunningly purrs to imitate that boiling which does not exist. This writer, after having made an astounding prologue about camps and armies, about alarms and enemies, about seventy-six and devastation, invasions and destruction, then exhibits hundreds of thousands of victims and immolations, summons 300,000 temperance men, and astounds us with reiterations, and levies *en masse*, he envelopes the imagination in the fumes and vapours of intemperance, and

with the semblance of affright, he now plunges Popery into those waters of bitterness in which he had extinguished the drunkard. Unquestionably it is a good specimen of the bathos, but according to every rule of rhetoric, here it is a beauty, for the object was to describe a plunge.

But why is he angry with Popery. Reason first: Because Popery and the enlightened freedom of the republic cannot coexist. Answer: They have coexisted, they do coexist, they will continue to coexist; they may therefore coexist, they can therefore coexist, let them coexist. Now, my good friends, we have gone through all the moods and tenses with their coexistence; you and I both do know the fact that they have coexisted; and this single fact, whose truth no one can question, which even the writer of the *Telegraph* dare not deny, overturns his whole theory. Reason second: Popery stupefies the conscience. Answer second: This is not only an unwarranted assumption, but a palpable falsehood. When an attempt is made by any one worth notice to sustain the charge, he shall find the answer here given fully upheld. Reason third: Popery blinds the understanding. Answer third: This is not only a gratuitous, and a false assertion, but it emanates from a spirit which is equally bereft of humility, of charity, of modesty, of benignity, as of truth. No attempt is made to prove its correctness: should any one undertake the task and appear to make progress, he shall not proceed without being encountered. Reason fourth: Popery withholds the only light which can guide human reason aright. Answer fourth: I shall not affect to misunderstand this; I look upon it to be the hackneyed assertion, that by this light is meant the Bible. This is not withheld by the Catholic Church; but she has preserved it. Without her guardianship it would long since have been lost; without her testimony it would be no authority; she not only gives to her children the book, but also its commissioned expositor: as the state not only gives to us her statutes, but also her judiciary, and as without the latter the former would be useless; so in religion, the book without its commissioned judge would prove a rock of destruction in place of being the foundation of doctrine. It is untrue that the Catholic Church withholds the only light which can guide human reason aright; but it is true that she warns her children against receiving or relying upon the mutilated and imperfect and mistranslated volumes which the evangelical societies have substituted for the word of God; as it is equally true that she cautions them against misrepresentations, and misapplications, and a submission to tribunals illegally and unwarrantably claiming a heavenly commission, whose existence they cannot prove. When he who makes the charge shall expand his reason, I shall develope my answer. Reason

fifth: Popery makes the whole man a superstitious slave to the impositions of a crafty priesthood. Answer fifth: This is but an assertion, couched in language equally offensive to the priest and the people, without a single particle of evidence either to sustain its averments, or to justify its epithets. I can only say of it, as of those that preceded it, he has asserted—I have denied: upon him lies the obligation of adducing proof or submiting to the consequences. When he supplies this defect, I shall feel myself called upon to sustain my position.

I have shown you this charge, I have exhibited to you the manner in which he accounts for the alarm that he has given. I appeal to you whether he was justified in thus terrifying his readers. His last publication contains the account of an incursion of marauders upon some families at Southampton, and the horrible butchery of perhaps more than one hundred persons, who were left unprotected by the effective male population, because, as the Norfolk paper informs us, "they were absent at camp-meeting in Gates county, some miles off, a circumstance which gave a temporary security to the brigands in the perpetration of their butcheries." He does not place any *republic in danger* as the caption to this. Yet besides the butcheries thus perpetrated, justice will necessarily destroy the lives of the wretches concerned in this atrocity; it is impossible that they should escape; not only public justice, but public security compels to the most unsparing search, and its consequences. Was it Popery produced this? I would entreat the writer to abandon his fancies, and to dwell upon facts. Let him trace effects to their causes, and he will find enemies to the peace and the tranquillity of our republic nearer home than in Popery. I would recommend to him to reserve his alarms and his wailings for causes which too plainly demand them, and to pay more attention to the real camps of his associates, than to the imaginary camps of non-existent enemies.

I remain, my friends, Yours respectfully,

B. C.

LETTER VIII

What, shall opinion then, of nature free
And liberal as the vagrant air, agree
To rust in chains like these, imposed by things
Which, less than nothing, ape the pride of kings. *Churchill.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 5, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—I now come to exhibit to you the drift of the para-

graphist. He informs his readers, that "the danger to the republic from men of this stamp," that is, Catholics, tolerant Protestants, drunkards, profane swearers, sabbath-breakers, gamblers, the votaries of dissipation, and infidels, "has been increased by the fact, that they fill some of its important places of trust." Thus, the object of the party whose mouthpiece the editor is, clearly must be, to exclude from office not only Catholics and tolerant Protestants, but all those whom the evangelicals designate as infidels. He first informs us, "that a bad man injures all with whom he has influence; he injures the community in which he lives; he injures the republic." He proceeds to inform us, that not only is "danger threatened, but injury has been inflicted" upon the community and the Republic "by some hundreds of thousands of the subjects of Popery and intemperance." He then states, that "thousands of others whose example and influence, even while they plume themselves for patriots, are injuring the republic." Amongst them he enumerates specially "sabbath-breakers, who are weakening the restraints of virtue, and countenancing vice, and encouraging others to neglect the instructions and ordinances of the Church of Christ." Thus, when we know that the Church of Christ as contra-distinguished from the synagogue of Satan, means the evangelical combination, as segregated, because of its self-righteousness, from all the tolerant Protestants, the infidels, the ungodly, and the subjects of Popery and intemperance,—we can easily perceive, when sabbath-breaking is the theme, that the great complaint is the refusal of Congress to comply with the demand of the church, for stopping the travelling of the mails on Sunday. This refusal is weakening the restraints of virtue; this is the countenancing of vice; this the encouraging of others to neglect the instructions and ordinances of the Church of Christ! These instructions and ordinances, he informs us, are "the only efficient means which have ever been known for saving a people from gross ignorance, wickedness, and superstition." Thus, having shown us the sources of danger, and the authors of the injury to the republic, he goes on to exhibit how "the danger has been increased" by the fact that such persons "fill important places of trust" in the republic. Clearly, then, the remedy which he considers effectual, would be to put such men out of the offices, and to fill them with persons who would encourage others, by their precept and example, to reduce to practice the instructions and ordinances of the evangelical association. He does not like our present government. "So many of them," tolerant Protestants and infidels, "had, by some means, obtained important stations of trust a year or two since, that no Christian could speak plainly of the dangers to which his country was ex-

posed, without being charged with the crime of 'mingling religion with politics!' They seemed to regard the wise provisions of the constitution, to prevent the establishment of religion by law, as an ordinance to consign the world of politics to the dominion of infidelity. They seemed to think that they had an exclusive right to reign in the political world."

In all this, I believe we can evidently see the complaint to be, that the persons placed in political power took it into their heads that they were entrusted with the regulation of the political concerns of the country, without being obliged to share their concern in that regulation with the holy ones who claimed an exclusive right to reign in the religious world. And when, filled with the zeal of the house of the Lord, the pious fraternity essayed to aid these infidels—a complimentary name for our government—in the burdensome work of legislation, they were informed that this was mingling religion with politics. Then the saints protested that they sought not to have their church established by law, as that was forbidden by the constitution; I believe that they were perfectly sincere, for the object was not to place the church under the protection of Congress, but to take Congress under the direction of the church,—and against this there was indeed no express provision made in the constitution; so that really, without any palpable verbal violation of that instrument, their reasonable desire might be complied with! But if they complained of the men then in place of important trust, what would they say now? Or rather what have they said? I need but refer to the extracts which are contained in the *Miscellany* of last Saturday, to exhibit their shameful attack upon the President of the United States for daring to call to the post of attorney-general one of the best lawyers, one of the most consistent politicians, one of the most virtuous private characters in the United States, merely because he was of the same religion as the patriotic, the amiable, the venerable survivor of the band that established our liberty! Yes! my friends, one of the plain objects of these men and women who are banded together in the several evangelical associations, is the exclusion from political power of every one who is not of the brotherhood. But this is only as a lemma to their ulterior conclusion. Give them exclusive political power, and then, of course, they will use it for legislative purposes. Then the instructions and ordinances of the Church of Christ will of a surety be applied to the rational and religious purposes of saving the people from gross ignorance, wickedness, and superstition. The reform may indeed commence at the post-office, but where is it to stop?

Let me remind you of a few of the ordinances under which the Evangelicals formerly regulated the liberties of Connecticut.

"None shall hold any office who is not sound in the faith." To be sure it was also regulated that he should be "faithful to their dominion." Thus, you see the spirit is not changed. As yet they have not the power to make the enactment constitutionally; but let them have such a power as they calculate themselves upon acquiring through the instrumentality of their associations, and they will inevitably have the moral power of making this provision constitutional. They will then be able to revive the penalty. "And whoever votes for such a person shall pay a fine of one pound. For the second offence shall be disfranchised." That this is the object of the party there can be no question. What says the paragraphist? "Hence the outcry raised against the Rev. Dr. Ely for sentiments which he published relative to the importance of electing men of good principles, who could be trusted for civil rulers—sentiments which no man but an infidel need blush to avow." Doctor Ely's sentiments were, that none but men of good principles—of course no Papists, no infidels, no sabbath-breakers, no profane swearers, no drunkards, no tolerant Protestants, no anti-Christian moralists—should be elected to offices. And though this could not be immediately effected, he calculated that, by reason of the organized systems of the associations, especially of the Sunday Schools, the great bulk of the religious community could ere long be brought to a simultaneous action at the polls, and carry everything before them, according as the wisdom by which they were guided should direct. From candidates the transition is natural to electors. We might next expect the revival of the enactment, "No one shall be a freeman, or give a vote, unless he be converted, or a member of one of the churches allowed in this dominion!" And think you, good friends, that the Beast would be permitted to have "subjects." Would you find a Roman Catholic Church in the dominion? Why the laws themselves answer "No priest shall abide in this dominion. He shall be banished, and suffer death on his return." And this law extended to the priests of the Church of England, upon whom I have shown you they bestowed such pretty epithets, and of whom they furnish so many disgusting descriptions. Yet, there are priests of that church who, without reflecting upon the consequences, abet efforts which would produce their own ruin!—"priests may be seized by any one without a warrant." So says the puritanical legislation. Lest any person should harbour a doubt of the correctness of my meaning of the word "priest," or imagine that there was a disposition to treat "the Church of England" with kindness or indulgence, I shall furnish you with another

extract from the same code: "No one shall read common prayer, keep Christmas, or saints' day, make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play any instrument of music, except the drum, the trumpet, and the jews-harp."

Allow me to show what more may be reasonably expected if those men should succeed in their plans. "No Quaker or dissenter from the established worship of this dominion shall be allowed to give a vote at the election of magistrates, or of any officer." But, my friends, you neither know the history nor the characters of these men, if you imagine they will, after having attained this point, stop contented. No! The same restless spirit, the same grasping ambition, the same sectarian domination which led them to this acquisition, encouraged by the success of their efforts, will urge them to proceed; and they will re-enact that "No food and lodging shall be afforded to a Quaker, Adamite, or other heretic." And every one who belongs not to the evangelical combination is, in their estimation, an infidel or a heretic. "If any person turns Quaker, he shall be banished, and not suffered to return on pain of death." Papists may, of course, calculate upon giving up all expectation of remaining in the United States, when Dr. Ely's growing phalanx of voters is duly organized and efficient. It is quite against the consciences of the saints to permit the subjects of the beast to pollute the soil. I could give you the names of several of the associates in this city, who would not receive Catholics into their employ without enforcing a special clause, that they should be under control of their employers on Sundays, and some are honest enough to avow that the object is to prevent their going to Mass, and obliging them to go to an evangelical church. This is no isolated, no extraordinary case; it is frequent and usual amongst a large class of persons in Charleston to act upon this principle, though not so usual to make the avowal. Catholics looking for employment are thus perpetually worried and disappointed; and when they do get situations, in such places, without agreeing to the clause, they are liable to a variety of petty tyranny and mean vexations; by throwing obstacles in the way of their attending Mass, their going to the sacraments, and particularly from the shameful contrivance of endeavouring to starve them out of their religion, by keeping from them on days of abstinence such food as they are warranted, by their discipline, to use. Think you, my friends, that the petty malevolence which thus exhibits itself daily, in this city, and in so many other places, would, if it was clothed with power equal to its deformity, confine itself to such despicable annoyance? Care would, indeed, be taken, that Popery should not invade the land; chains would be fasten-

ed upon "the monster," and he would be smitten by the elect of the Lord. "Drunkards" would, perhaps, be permitted to remain, but they "shall have masters appointed by the select men, who are to debar them the liberty of buying and selling." Protestant Episcopalians must give up their priests. The prelates, of course, would stink in the nostrils of the godly, and common prayer-books and minced pies should disappear together. Whether organs would be permitted to remain is doubtful, as the jewsharp has been so little practised of late that its dulcet notes could, with great difficulty, be brought to equal the diapason; Quakers, Adamites, and other heretics, in a word, all dissenters from the church not united with the state, but domineering over the state, being banished; not only would the conveying of mails be stopped upon the Sabbath, but "no one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep houses, cut hair, or shave on the Sabbath day." Alas for the barber! this would not be his sole misfortune, for "Every male shall have his hair cut round, according to a cap." The fashionable touches of our titivators would be useless, as are the powder, bags, and puffs, and pomatum of their predecessors. "No one should run of a Sabbath day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, but reverently to and from church." "No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or fasting day." Are you, my friends, prepared for such domination as this? If you are ready to bow your necks to receive this yoke, of course, you will have no difficulty in permitting the enactment of a law similar to this: "Whoever wears clothes trimmed with silver or bone lace, above two shillings a yard, shall be presented by the grand jurors, and the select men shall tax the offender at the rate of £300 estate." I would ask whether any civilized nation, except under the dominion of this sect, ever submitted to such a code? I would ask whether any despot that ever ruled a degraded accumulation of vassals, dared to impose such a yoke? A man is not allowed to walk in his garden, nor a young mother to kiss her beloved infant on a Sunday! ! !

I assure you, my friends, that I by no means endeavour to create upon your minds an impression different from what exists on my own, when I exhibit to you those as the consequences likely to flow from the success of these efforts to create a Christian party in politics. In 1645 and '46, when the same party had no dominion over the English Parliament, but great encouragement from that assembly; they declared "That toleration was the appointing a city of refuge in men's consciences for the Devil to fly to; a toleration of soul murther, the greatest murther of all others."[15] In the *Book of Discipline*, published in the reign

[15] Bennet's *Introductory to Abridgment of the London Cases*, p. 6.

of Elizabeth, page 142, we read, "Kings no less than the rest, must obey, and yield to the authority of the ecclesiastical magistrate." One of their writers (Cartwright) explains this submission, "That princes must remember to subject themselves to the church, and to submit their scepters, and throw down their crowns before the church; yea, to lick the dust off the feet of the church," p. 645. Compare this with the complaints of their writers at present, that too many infidels have obtained places of power; that infidels seem to think they have an exclusive right to reign in the political world; that the instructions and ordinances of the church are disregarded by Sabbath breakers; that good men are seduced by pernicious errors; that Dr. Ely's plan is one which no man but an infidel need blush to avow. Add to this, the fact that although they complain that, a year or two since, so many bad men have by some means obtained important stations in the government, yet they have actually more than their proportion of those places, in their ratio to the rest of the population of the Union, which they consider the ungodly. The article in the Telegraph has stated his numbers at only 300,000, out of 12,000,000, which would be but one to thirty-nine. He has, however, underrated his own side. The whole population consists of adults and infants; he only gives us his adults, and even these are underrated. Instead of one saint to thirty-nine sinners, I think we may fairly give him one saint to seven sinners, provided he considers all the converted, and all the members of the evangelical churches and their families, as he ought, as belonging to the aggregate of his population. This would give them a right to one-eighth of the public offices and of the representation; and if they possess that portion they ought to be satisfied. How shall it be ascertained whether they have this portion?

On the 16th of April, the *Southern Religious Telegraph*, of March 5, 1831, informs us, a meeting was held at the First Presbyterian Church, in the city of Washington, for establishing Sunday schools in the valley of the Mississippi. This is one of the leading objects of the confederates, as it is through means of the Sunday schools Dr. Ely intends to secure the votes necessary to his own favourite object, of creating the dominion of a Christian party in politics. We may, therefore, fairly put down, as belonging to their party, or under its influence, all the advocates and operators who then and there came forward. The *Telegraph* informs us, in emphatic italics, that "the most of the speakers on the interesting occasion, were members of Congress. The friends of Sabbath schools will rejoice to learn that the most distinguished voices in our country are proclaiming the importance of the holy enterprise, which is to cheer and bless, and save the youth of our land, and re-echoing from the citadel

of freedom, the noble resolution adopted last May, by the American Sunday School Union." The *New York Observer*, another of the associated presses, informs us "the North, the South, the West, the Middle States were well represented on this occasion."

This does not look like the complaint of men feeling themselves treated with injustice, and bereft of friends in important stations of the government of the United States! "Never did our legislators appear in an attitude of superior dignity and interest, than as advocates, in the temple of God, of the great system of religious education, which is wielding its potent influence through their country, commanding the best services of the best men in all communities, of all professions, and destined to pervade the whole of this mighty republic, and even to encircle the globe itself." After declaring that the fact of the system being advocated by such men, proves that there is no design of uniting church and state, the *Observer* proceeds—"It is a fortunate circumstance that so many and so highly distinguished public men, should have first openly stood forth at the seat of government, in defence of that very institution against which the most envenomed shafts of infidel fury have been hurled." Yet the writer, who is one of the heralds of the party, complains of the danger to the republic, from the fact that what it is pleased to call the "infidel party, and the irreligious party," have not only filled some of its important places of trust, but by some means have obtained such stations, a year or two since, as to prevent Christians speaking of the dangers to which their country is exposed by Popery, intemperance, infidelity and Sabbath-breaking, without being charged with the crime of mingling religion with politics! Have they not more than double their share of officers, and senators and representatives? Is there a single public institution into which they have not endeavoured to worm themselves, and successfully in most instances? On the 16th of April, had they not Senator Grundy in the chair, Senator Frelinghuysen preaching, Senator Webster declaiming, and judges and members of Congress and other public men, without measure, applauding? Had they not the President of the United States apologizing and transmitting a message? And of what do they complain? Verily, because they had not all the public officers, all the Congress, all the power of the Union at their command. They were unable to clog the wheels of the mail stages; the mighty meed of honours and power of the court; nay, even the prospect of encircling the great globe itself, were mere nothing, whilst Mordecai sat quietly at the palace gate, unscathed by the lightning of their zeal. They must have uncontrolled dominion; there must be no Popery in the land; infidelity must bow down; intemperance must

be extinguished; men's hair must be cut to the measure of a cap; minced pies and Christmas must disappear; neither mail-bags, nor razors, nor scissors, nor brushes, nor combs shall be touched on the Sabbath; pots and saucepans must have rest, stages must lie by; nor steam shall run, nor fire shall burn, nor men shall run, nor mother shall kiss her babe. These are to be the tokens which will usher in, as glorious auspices, the millennium of the sacred host!

I believe, my friends, that, from the preceding review, there will exist very little doubt on the mind of any impartial and close observer, respecting at least two great objects of that portion of our citizens who consider themselves as religious. No one can reasonably doubt their efforts and their steady determination to create a Christian party in politics; that this party is to consist of those whom they consider sanctified, or converted; that although they are aware that it is not at present a majority, they calculate upon its becoming so, through the operation of religious associations, especially the Sunday schools; that this party is to support such political measures as best agree with the instructions and ordinances of the evangelical churches; that for this purpose the members will, at the ballot boxes, be induced to act by one spirit, from one impulse to vote for no candicate who will not merit the confidence of the religious and evangelical. Thus, though they will not seek to make the church dependent upon the state, they will succeed in making the state dependent upon the church. The other object is to deliver the republic from its enemies, from the dangers with which it is threatened; one of the most formidable of which is Popery. I might, upon this head, rest satisfied with the evidence which I have adduced; but you will perhaps allow me to show you that the same sentiments which are expressed by the writer of the paragraph which I review, are entertained everywhere by the same party. I shall give only two specimens. Dr. Beecher gave lectures upon Catholicism lately in Boston, and in his second lecture on the doctrines of the Church of Rome, which was the sixth of his course as given in the *Telegraph* of March 5, we read:

"He feared that the siren song of 'no danger,' would beguile this people in the quiet enjoyment of their great privileges; and that while we were slumbering in the lap of indulgence, we should lose the hardy courage of our fathers, and might be 'shorn of our locks of glory,' our blessings snatched from us before we were aware."

"Infidelity is ready for an alliance with the papal power, to consummate the destruction of our liberties, and the movements of our enemies must be watched with vigilance. If our fears are excited, no physical power can enslave this people. There is in them an unconquerable spirit to defend their rights. The danger is not in an open attack, but in stratagems and wiles. If the conscience be enslaved to

superstition, and the liberty of private judgment in religious concerns be wrested from us, our civil rights will of course be prostrated.''

The two points are uniformly the same in all the productions of the party, viz., first to identify the Catholic church and infidelity; the second to impress the lovers of republicanism with the idea that the toleration of the Catholic church will destroy liberty—and thus to excite them to banish Catholics from the republic. Yet is it not strange that the editor of the *Telegraph* has so far forgotten himself, as to insert in the same number of his paper a practical refutation of the first of Doctor Beecher's positions, by showing in the following notice that the same infidelity which he dreads, is that which persecuted and nearly destroyed the Catholic church in France?

''*Deistical Works.*—We observe that the infidel publications of France—works that had a powerful influence, in introducing 'the Reign of Terror' in Paris, forty years ago, are now advertised for sale in this city. Spirited efforts, it seems are to be made to scatter the seeds of poison and death among our citizens. These efforts to propagate the delusions of infidelity—of infidelity of the darkest character, are not unworthy of the friends of morality and religion. If they succeed, virtue and social order must give place to licentiousness and vice, which will be followed by crime and enormity—and at length by miseries for which there will be no mitigation.''

Now I think it would be somewhat difficult for him to show how this same infidelity which in Europe is so hostile to the Roman Catholic religion, can be its ally in America. Do the Catholic clergy disseminate these works?—I must not, however, expect to find this writer free from contradictions:—he seems to love them.

In the same paper, he presents us with a letter from some evangelical students in Scotland to their brethren at Princeton, N. J., in which they inform these latter that they ''seek to accelerate the downfall of Satan by every effort in their power,'' and amongst other fields in which they may labour with effect, in overwhelming Satan, ''the more popish districts of Ireland readily obtrude themselves on their notice,'' and they remind their brethren that in Scotland as well as in the United States ''the adherents of the Catholic church, falsely so called, have for several years been labouring with extreme assiduity to spread the principles of Popery.'' They hail the French revolution as, ''it will, they trust, prove a deathblow to the interests of Popery upon the continent.'' Shall I then charge as leagued with the infidels of France, the evangelical students of Scotland, and the evangelical editors of America, and the evangelical ministers, who from their pulpits gave glory to God, and called upon their evangelical hearers to exult in the success of the French infidels, who prepared for that revolution and mainly effected

it through the instrumentality of those very works, against which the editor of the *Telegraph* declaims?

I have by no means gone deeply into the documents which lie under my hand. Yet, I trust, I have shown you enough to make it clear, that two of the great objects of the saints, and two of primary importance in their estimation, are, to acquire influence over the government, and to root out the Roman Catholic religion; that they aim at succeeding in the first, by means of the votes through their organized associations; and in the second by creating distrust, jealousy, fear, and horror in the public mind, using to this end, calumny and misrepresentation.

I remain, my friends,

Yours respectfully,

B. C.

LETTER IX

Too well I know thee, but for King no more,
This is not Lisbon, nor the circle this,
Where, like a statute thou hast stood besieged
By sycophants and fools, the growth of courts;
Where thy gull'd eyes in all the gaudy round
Met nothing but a lie in every face;
And the gross flattery of a gaping crowd
Envious who first should catch, and first applaud
The stuff of royal nonsense:

Dryden.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 12, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—I beg to draw your attention to a few more topics of the article upon which these letters are a comment. I shall first exhibit to you the manner in which the writer lectures our public men. Treating of intemperance he writes, "while the land has been stained with the blood of his victims, many of our political watchmen, who ought to see that the Republic receives no detriment, have been so intent on elections, that they have not appeared to know of this invasion!" Again, in the next paragraph:

"The same enemy has plundered our citizens of millions of dollars annually. Had one-half of this sum been contributed for the education of men to give sound religious instruction to thousands of the uninstructed and prejudiced in this country, or to send the blessings of Christianity to the deluded heathen, some of our political seers would have raised the cry of 'Enthusiasm!' 'These bigoted fanatics will drain the people of their money, and ruin the country!' But there is no bigotry—no fanaticism, it seems, in drunkenness. There is no danger when the guardians

of the republic sleep, while millions are plundered from the people to prepare an offering of human blood for this insatiable Moloch.''

Again, after complaining that ''men of that stamp'' which he dislikes, ''fill some of the important places of trust'' of the republic, he adds, ''they seemed to regard the wise provisions of the Constitution to prevent the establishment of religion by law, as an ordinance to consign the world of politics to the dominion of infidelity. They seemed to think that they had an exclusive right to reign in the political world.'' The passages manifest the writer's notion that it is the duty of our political watchmen, to regulate his temperance societies, so as to prevent the expenditure of those yearly millions of dollars for drink, and to provide either directly or indirectly for home and foreign missions, by encouraging the education of clerical candidates. He seems to charge the ''political seers'' as he facetiously calls them, with ''sleeping while millions are plundered from the public,'' though they are the ''guardians of the republic.'' And yet while they sleep, they ''have been intent upon elections.'' My friends, I am perfectly unable to discover, if he means our General Government, as I suppose he must, upon what ground he makes this very wanton aggression. To sustain his charge he should show, first, that the government, that is, Congress had the power to do what he requires; next, that it was the duty of Congress; and thirdly, that this duty was neglected, either because of their supineness, or because of their being intent on elections; for I will not fasten upon him the blunder of which he was guilty in conjoining sleep and watchfulness.

Now I deny at once, that Congress has any power whatever to interfere directly or indirectly with the temperance societies or education, or missionary societies, or with the conduct of individuals in respect to either. Any legislative action of Congress upon either of these subjects would be direct usurpation, palpably invalid, and dangerous to the liberties of the republic: and as such, it would, and it ought to be resisted. The paragraphist appears to be altogether ignorant of the principles upon which our General Government has been formed, as also of the source and the extent of its powers. I doubt if any state government in the Union possesses the power which he would call upon it to assume; I know several which positively do not; and where any legislation upon either of those subjects would of course be gross usurpation, which it would be the duty of every patriot to oppose.

The governments under which our affairs are administered, derive their powers from conventions of the people, in which alone the sovereignty, properly and strictly speaking, resides. These conventions have

expressed the popular will in written constitutions; the legislatures derive their powers from the people, through those constitutions, and only to their extent: in many of them are to be found declarations of rights, in others of them restraining clauses and principles are found, and in some of our constitutions a combination of both exists; and where the legislative power is thus restrained by the popular will, any effort to violate, or to evade the restraint, would be an act of palpable usurpation. It was to the Roman dictator who was clothed with absolute and unrestricted power, that the charge was given "to see that the republic received no detriment." If given to a consul it was only upon an extraordinary case of great and imminent danger, when the very use of the phrase was equivalent to the withdrawal of the usual clogs and restraints by which his power was limited. Our governments are not absolute and unrestricted: our legislators have not unlimited power conferred upon them, they are not complete sovereigns, and so far from having unlimited and absolute power "to see that the republic receives no detriment," the power of Congress is exceedingly restrained, as regards the people. I am no advocate for the notion of nullification—but I do know that our General Government has not power either to enact that we shall abstain from meat on Friday or Saturday, nor that we shall eschew whiskey on Sunday; nor has it the power to lay an excise tax of one cent per hogshead upon the said whiskey, for the purpose of giving the said cent to aid the education of a missionary, either for Virginia, or Liberia, or Othaheite, or Ceylon, or China. Why then does the paragraphist assail our "political seers?" Does he desire to urge them to usurpation, and the people to resistance? I defy his utmost ingenuity to exhibit any more in which Congress has the power to aid him directly or indirectly.

He appears to have embraced the doctrine respecting government, which was preached up in so many parts of Europe, by the churchmen of all denominations, who found the government favourable to their views, or who expected to make it favourable. They declared that it was the duty of the civil magistrate to protect the church, to aid in the propagation of truth, in the diffusion of the Gospel, in the providing for the instruction of the people in the way of salvation. It is not my business here to examine how far this might or might not have been a duty of any European or other government. I merely content myself with denying that such power has been given to the Congress of the United States. The doctrine of our Constitution plainly recognises, in that body, only the powers which have been specially delegated thereto; and in vain will you look through the catalogue of the conceded powers, for that of protecting the church, or, as the confession of faith of the Presbyterian

Church expresses itself, chapter xxiii. a. iii. "Yet as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord." They have no such duty in this republic, nor have they any such power. They are appointed for a special object; and they have no authority beyond their special appointment: that appointment is, to look to such political concerns as have been entrusted to their exclusive management. They are forbidden to mingle religion with politics, not because they are specially prohibited from making any "law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof:" but because the people of the states, in creating their powers, gave them no such delegation.

The first article of the same (xxiii.) chapter of the Presbyterian *Confession of Faith*, contains an assertion not recognised by our republic: "God the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him, over the people, for his own glory and the public good." So much of this as asserts that God ordained the civil magistrate to be under him, for his own glory, is, as regards our general government, a political heresy, and the Presbyterian *Confession of Faith* is, so far, in direct contradiction to our constitutional doctrine. This being a fundamental error, its consequences extensively pervade the whole of the opinions and acts of the body. The first consequence will be found in the same article, "and to this end, he hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil-doers." The reasoning is this, God having appointed the civil magistrate under himself, for his own glory, gave to him the power of the sword to encourage them that are good (that is who promote that glory), and for the punishment of evil-doers, (who oppose that glory.) It more distinctly exhibits itself in the article (ii.) of the same chapter, where it tells us that Christians who execute the office of magistrate, "in the managing thereof, ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth," of course the "civil magistrate" is not, in this document, the executive or the judicial only, but the legislator also: it is, therefore, his Duty as God's delegate, for his glory, to use his legislative power to maintain piety; not, however, it is true, by violating the wholesome law of the commonwealth. I shall show you before I close this letter, of how little value is this semblance of a restraint. For we shall see that God's law by which piety is to be upheld, will be produced as the first obligation by which the legislator is directed. It is here worthy of remark, that the texts of Scripture which are quoted, are precisely the same which, in Europe, the advocates

of the divine right of kings have adduced to sustain their position; and they are equally inapplicable in one case as in the other, being, to use the mildest phrase, a mistake and misapplication in each case.

The third article of chapter xxiii. after declaring that civil magistrates may not assume the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, (I should like to know what they mean by this phrase,) or in the least interfere in matters of faith: goes on to say, "yet as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord." How are they to protect it? In what manner are they to be nursing fathers? They cannot make a church establishment. Let us see whether the article itself will help us out. But first, I repeat that the people of these states never gave to Congress any authority whatever to nurse or to protect the church. Hence, the Congress has no duty in this respect; the magistrates or officers appointed under its authority have not any power in this regard, and consequently, no nursing duty as civil magistrates. Thus the spirit of the article is at variance with the spirit of the constitution: and the admonitions given by the evangelical party are founded upon a false assumption, viz., that it is the duty of the civil magistrate as a nursing father, to protect the church. The Presbyterian Church is not alone in using this phraseology; the Associate, the Scotch, and the Reformed Churches have the same article. The Reformed Dutch Church, in her *Confession of Faith*, article xxxvi., says of civil magistrates: "their office is, not only to have regard unto, and watch for the welfare of the civil state; but also to protect the holy church service; to prevent and extirpate all idolatry and false worship; to destroy the kingdom of Antichrist; to promote the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and to take care that the word of the Gospel be preached everywhere, that God may be honoured and worshipped by every one as he commands in his word."

We need not be astonished that persons who believe as an article of faith, that the civil magistrate has the power here described, and is bound by his office, to act as here indicated, should accuse them of being "asleep" in not extirpating Popery, which they in article xxix., describe as a "false church," "persecuting those who live holily according to the word of God, and rebuke her for her errors, covetousness, and idolatry." But these good gentlemen forget that the people of America, who are the true sovereigns of these republics, never gave such power to their civil magistrates or to the general government: and consequently it is not their "office"—but it would be gross and palpable usurpation for them to attempt its existence.

It is true, the Presbyterian article goes on to say that the nursing

fathers should afford this protection to the church "without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner, that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions without violence or danger." The articles of their confession may, I presume, be fairly made to explain each other. Upon this principle I proceed to examine whether this confession means that Roman Catholics, as a denomination of Christians, form any portion of what the article describes as the church which is to be protected. The xxvth. chapter art. ii., describes the visible church as consisting of "all those who throughout the world, profess the true religion, together with their children." Article iv. states that "particular churches which are members of that Catholic Church which is sometimes more or less visible, are more or less pure." Article v. states that "some have so degenerated, as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan." The text referred to, for the purpose of sustaining this assertion, is that which the saints uniformly quote to show that the Roman Catholic Church is Babylon, the habitation of devils.—Article vi. describes the Pope, who is the visible head of the Roman Catholic Church, as Antichrist, the man of sin, the son of perdition, exalting himself against God and Christ. Hence, we may fairly conclude that Roman Catholics are not considered members of that church which the nursing fathers are bound to protect: and the Christian denominations, of which none is to receive a preference, are those particular churches, which, though differing in their degree of purity, yet have not so far degenerated as to become synagogues of Satan, they are churches, not "no churches!"

But supposing Roman Catholics to be admitted not to be Antichrist, but to be a Christian denomination, the clause would, if it consisted merely of the words "without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest," seem to imply that no distinction was to be drawn; but the general expressions are greatly restrained by the specific description, "in such a manner, that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, and free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions without violence or danger." Thus leaving them at liberty to discharge their sacred functions without being exposed to violence or danger for their performance, would appear to be the extent of protection. The last clause of the article might be quoted to sustain this construction, and to show that even Catholics may be included in the protection. "It is the duty of the civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner, as that no person be suffered, either

on pretence of religion or infidelity to offer any indignity, violence, abuse or injury to any other person whatsoever, and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance." Now, if Roman Catholics are to have the benefit of this clause, how does it happen that the civil magistrates do not protect their good name against the calumny and vituperation of the saints? How does it happen that the civil magistrates do not interfere to protect them from the indignity of vulgar nicknames, from the injury of being falsely charged with designs upon the liberties of the republic, from the indignity of being classed with drunkards, blasphemers, and debauchees? Is it for neglecting to perform this duty, that the paragraphist assails the political watchmen, and charges them with drowsiness and negligence? Clearly not. Is it for neglecting to protect the persons, and the good name of the saints? Clearly not. "Nursing father" must then, in his estimation, mean something more than being this description of protector. Let us look at the only remaining clause of this third article, to try what it contains. "And as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder the due exercise thereof among voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief." Now this is somewhat ambiguous, as being susceptible of two interpretations. It states clearly, first, that Christ gave a law; secondly, that no commonwealth should interfere with the observance of that law: all this is plain: but the question arises, and an important one, Who shall give the true and correct meaning of that law, where a difference arises as to that meaning? I am prepared to say that the principle of our government is, that each denomination is to follow its own interpretation, and government is not to interfere with them in their construction, nor to place any let or hindrance to their own observance of that law so interpreted, where it does not injure the community at large. They may believe what they please; they may have such mode of church government as they please; they may pray and fast, and read, and sing, and dance, as they think that law requires or authorizes: and the civil magistrate has no power to interfere with them whilst they alone are concerned. But if any one of them shall tell the civil magistrate, that God Almighty forbids his transmitting the mail-bag on a particular day, and entrusting it to be so conveyed by another person, who thinks that the Almighty left him at liberty to undertake it, and declare to that magistrate that he is guilty of a high crime, and violation of the law of God, and that his human law is therefore to be nullified, as being in violation of the constitution of Jesus Christ: this

sectarian goes out of his sphere, and acts with equal impropriety, as the Israelite, or Seventh-day Baptist would, who should insist on the legislator's following his interpretation of the divine law, and thereby require the mail to be arrested on the Sabbath (Saturday), and force the evangelical saint to travel with it on the Lord's day, (Sunday.) Hence, if under this clause, it should be contended that the civil magistrate ought to be a nursing father to the church, and is bound to protect, by putting no hindrance, that is, by carrying into execution amongst other sects, any construction which some pre-eminent religious societies might give to the divine law; the doctrine would be in direct contradiction to our principles of general government. This latter, I believe, is the construction which the greater portion of the saints give to the clause. This construction fully agrees with the doctrine in article xxxvi. of the *Confession of Faith* of the Dutch Reformed Church, which is evangelical. The office of the civil magistrate is therein declared to be "to protect the holy church service; and to prevent and extirpate all idolatry, and false worship," and so forth. If this was the duty of "the political watchmen," then it was their duty to avoid sleeping whilst such enemies as intemperance and Popery were making inroads. The broad construction of general welfare, or seeing that the republic receives no detriment, is one which no good republican can admit. It is giving to Congress a power to do everything it might fancy: and in this instance it is pleaded for the purpose of calling upon them to prevent distillation, to send officers to examine our houses, watch over us at meals, and break our jugs and bottles. I am an enemy to intemperance, but I am also an enemy to tyrants; and I know of no tyranny more despotic and despicable than that which the saints would exercise over our civil authorities, if they were permitted: and which they have endeavoured to exercise under the pretext that the civil powers of legislation, of judgment, and of execution, must be subordinate to the law of God, as expounded by those men who thus seek for liberty to restrain our liberty.—They have recourse to the old European maxim, that civil officers are God's deputies, so that they might themselves have the right, as God's interpreters, to guide these deputies. They would form a new species of heavenly aides-de-camp in the church militant, to bring the high behests of Jehovah to the several leaders of the civil host. Yet, these are the men who affect so deep an "interest in transmitting our republican institutions unimpaired to their children!"

The principles of our saints, respecting our government, appear to be derived from their confessions of faith; and some of them are, that the civil magistrate is a deputy under God, over the people to promote

God's glory; that he is bound to protect the true church; that he is bound to extirpate idolatry; that he is obliged to take care that the word of God be preached and distributed; that he must be cautious not to legislate against God's holy law; that he do not encourage others to neglect the instructions and ordinances of the church of Christ; and that in these instructions and ordinances he will see plainly exhibited the true intent and meaning of that law.

The constitutional principles respecting the general government are, that all its power is derived from the people of the United States; that neither the individual officers nor the aggregate, shall assume any power which has not been plainly granted; that such assumption would be palpable usurpation; that the people not only did not give them any power to regulate or protect morals or religion, but absolutely forbade their interference with religion in that way which alone seemed possibly open to them; that the people then and now, were and are, an aggregate holding various religious opinions, not only widely different, but absolutely contradictory in several and most important particulars; that, therefore, it was never conceded that the law of God as understood by any one division, or any number of divisions, was to be given as a rule to guide or to restrain the legislation, judgments, or execution of the general government;—nay, even that if all its members were Jews, Mohametans, Universalists, Catholics, and Infidels, as they might be; yet they would not be authorized to denounce, nor to inconvenience Evangelicals, Episcopalains, Baptists, Covenanters, Seceders, Unitarians, nor any other denomination, by legislating according to their own special religious notions. They were commissioned not to regulate religion, nor morals, but to manage civil and political concerns, and they have no power to be nursing fathers to the church. The saints have mistaken our constitution. I must resume this subject. Yours respectfully, B. C.

LETTER X

Did nations combat to make one submit;
Or league to teach all kings true sovereignty?
What! shall reviving thraldom again be
The patch'd up idol of enlightened days!
Shall we who struck the lion down, shall we
Pay the wolf homage?

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 19, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—In order more fully to lay before you what I con-

sider to be the grand mistake of our saints as regards the power of our general government, I shall in this letter enter somewhat fully into the development of those facts and principles, which I consider necessary to be well understood, to insure our arriving at a correct conclusion.

In the first place, then, I state that our general government is so completely different from all those which have existed, or now exist, in other places, that no argument of analogy can be drawn from their powers or acts to show what those of our federal government are, or ought to be. I might indeed, discover some institutions bearing a great similarity, but the principle of their construction was essentially different, and though there might be considerable semblance in the appearance, there would be no true likeness. Perhaps, making due allowance for the difference between principalities and republics, and between an emperor and a president; the original frame of the Holy Roman empire, or Germanic confederation, would be found the nearest approximation upon the principle. But the points of difference would be found to exceed the points of agreement; and in the very particular which contains the ground of the evangelical mistake there is not only a total want of analogy, but there exists a palpable contradiction; so that what was the sworn obligation of the emperor, would be in the president a violation of his solemn and sacred duty. Thus, I consider that endeavouring to apply the rules and maxims of Europe, especially to our general administration, is worse than ridiculous.

It might be asked, why I confine my remarks to the federal government; why not extend them to the state governments? There are two reasons, either of which would, I believe, be sufficient to restrain me. First—the efforts of the associates are directed to the action of the general government. And secondly—the principle of power is not the same in the general as in the state governments. A contest might with more facility be maintained, to show that perhaps the state governments are not altogether bereft of a power of religious regulation, and it could, I think, be established that they are clothed with jurisdiction to preserve and to guard the public morals; when I think it perfectly clear, that the federal government has no power as respects either, save as far as the territory under its exclusive jurisdiction is concerned. Hence, my observations are altogether directed to maintain the incompetency of the federal government to legislate upon religion or morals, directly or indidectly, for the people of the United States, or to assume in its legislation that this is what the saints call a Christian country, rather than one which they would designate infidel and anti-Christian.

Before I come to the special inquiry respecting the origin and extent

of the powers of the general government, I feel it necessary that we should fully understand each other upon the principles of religious legislation. I trust there will be no difficulty in admitting that each individual has at least one indefeasible right with which no power can interfere; that right is the liberty of thought, in the most extended meaning of the expression. I shall develope the meaning of the proposition, as I desire to be perfectly distinct. God has given to every reasonable being the powers of perception; it would be absurd to attempt an interference with this power, save by presenting the object properly before the mind. Perhaps the individual himself has no control over this power, when he is placed where it must be exercised. If he opens his eyes he cannot avoid seeing; if you speak he cannot avoid hearing; if you touch him he cannot avoid feeling. It is true, he might keep his eyes closed, or his ears stopped, or avoid coming within your reach; but when he does not thus place obstacles, he is, so far as perception is concerned, rather passive and powerless. He is morally accountable for those perceptions which he voluntarily causes; but when he puts the cause he cannot prevent the effect. When he reasons upon his perceptions, if he reasons honestly, he has no control over his conclusions. He might dishonestly, through prejudice or partiality, avoid examining those premises which would guide him to a correct result, or he might willingly assume without good grounds, those which will mislead him; and then he draws a legitimate though a false conclusion from falsehoods thus culpably admitted, and this admission is criminal. He might also honestly err, through want of information or of intellect, and then though wrong, he is not criminal. No human tribunal can interfere with this mental process; it cannot be regulated by human legislation. The tribunal of conscience and the tribunal of that God who will judge all the acts of the soul, are the only ones before which the guilty can be convicted. Subject to this accountability, every individual has the right to investigate for the discovery of truth; and this right is indefeasible. Nay, it would be ridiculous to attempt to coerce it; for it would be impossible.

No man has a right to compel another to profess a lie. This is too plain to need either explanation or proof. A lie is a crime; and he who voluntarily compels another to be guilty, is not innocent.

From these premises I infer, that no human government can be vested with a power to require a man to profess what he does not believe, nor can it compel him to entertain any particular belief. But a different question is now to be examined, that is, whether government can, for the public benefit, require under penalty, that an individual shall not publish what he considers truth; and whether he may be com-

pelled to conform to a course of proceeding which he considers at least useless and unnecessary, if not mischievous.

To solve this last question, I would first ask, whether the course of proceeding to which the government requires conformity, is clearly and absolutely necessary to attain the end for which it was created, and whether it be mischievous in reality, or only in the opinion of one, or of a small number of individuals. And whether, if it be mischievous, it is so, because of its immorality, or is mischievous only in so far as it is injurious to a few, and beneficial to the public at large. If it be not immoral, and if it be useful to the great community, and so declared by them, or by their government, clearly the maxim will hold; *Salus populi suprema lex*, and the government can, and ought to require conformity.

Hence, where the government has not reason to suspect that it might be in error, and the non-conforming individual right, and that the legitimate end for which it was constituted, can be best attained by requiring the conformity of the few to the conduct observed by the great mass of the community, and that if this be not enforced, that end can scarcely, if at all, be attained; the individual, or the few, are obliged to conform, or to leave the community.

Let us now apply this to the subject of religion: and to be better able to do so, let us first agree as to what religion is. I would say that it is, paying to God homage in that way which he himself points out. I assume here, that he has given a revelation. Perhaps we had better first see what government cannot do. It cannot make a system of religion. Because that is, as we have seen, the prerogative of God, and to be exercised only by him, or by deputation from him, and that deputation must be so plainly given, as not to admit of any rational doubt. Now, the deputation to make such a system has never, that I know of, been claimed by any of our modern governments: certainly not by any of our American governments, whether state or federal.

It cannot publish as certain, that any particular system of religion is true, unless it has such evidence of its truth, as will remove every reasonable doubt that this system is that which was given by God: and the ground for reasonable doubt can never be removed by such testimony as is liable to error; and upon their own acknowledgement, every one of the Protestant churches is liable to err in giving this testimony; hence no government can reasonably proclaim any one Protestant church to be the teacher of the true system of God's revelation.

No government can require any man to sustain a religion by any act that he believes to be contrary to God's law or revelation, or subject him to any inconvenience for refusing to sustain it, unless the govern-

ment itself is infallibly certain that the law or revelation is exactly what it proclaims, and has no ground whatever of doubt that the recusant is palpably in error.

Nor can a government, even with this certainty, interfere with the conscientious rights of individuals, nor can it restrain their profession or acts, except it be specially charged with this duty by that power whence it derives its authority, save so far as to preserve the peace and temporal well-being of the community.

In the establishment of the Christian revelation, its author never gave to any temporal or civil government any such power, by any delegation special or general; consequently, if any government claims any such power, it must be shown that it is derived, like all the other powers which it possesses, from those who created it.

I have here developed the great principles upon which I believe we all agree, and which, being duly applied to the facts of each case as they are ascertained, will enable us to arrive at proper conclusions.

There is, however, one other principle of jurisprudence which is universally admitted by all reasonable men, and which is sustained also by the Redeemer himself, respecting the duty of a government, having no doubt whatever as to what is the system of true religion, and charged either by God or by man with its protection; that principle is, that when religious error has made considerable progress in the state, and that it is impossible peaceably to correct the evil, the government must permit its existence, even though it do not approve of, or countenance the same:[16] for even a considerable minority possess rights of which they cannot be divested; and, in this case, the evil of oppressing a large body of citizens, who, though in religious error, yet are otherwise in the peace of the state, would produce serious evils to the community at large. This

[16] Religious Indifferentism has no place in Catholic theology. There is only one true religion, and therefore impious and absurd is the system of dogmatic tolerance by which to every man is given the right of unqualified freedom of thought in the matter of religion, and freedom of determining the worship to be given God. Freedom of choice in religion is repugnant to the divine precept. It is never lawful for Catholics to co-operate in heresy. Nor is it lawful for them to sanction, either practically or theoretically, heretical doctrines or practices. If the fact of heresy assert itself so that its removal is a moral impossibility, then a certain hypothetical tolerance may be admitted. An absolute toleration is never permissible. In his masterful Encyclical on the *Christian Constitution of States*, Leo XIII, proclaims the Catholic position: "The Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who, for the sake of securing some great good or of hindering some great evil, allow patiently custom or usage to be a kind of sanction for each kind of religion having its place in the State. And in fact the Church is wont to take earnest heed that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will; for, as St. Augustine wisely reminds us: 'Man can not believe otherwise than of his own free will.' "—Ed.

is the case, in which an enemy has sown tares through the wheat; both spring up together: and yet the Saviour declares that we must leave the time of separation to his own harvest, when, in the order of nature, death will have cut down both.

How preposterous, then, would it be in a mixed community, to assert that a government which neither has a commission to interfere with the religion of individuals, or of the public composed of those individuals, and which has no reasonable ground of certainty by which it might ascertain the true religion, should have power to make religious discrimination between its citizens?

In Europe, when Christianity was fully established, the people believed, whether correctly or otherwise matters not for our present purpose, that Jesus Christ had established but one church, to whose care he committed the preservation of the deposit of his doctrine, and the dispensation of his sacraments: they also believed that this church consisted of the great body of prelates, who were the teachers, and, in case of controversy, the judges to testify by their judicial decision what Christ had revealed; at the head of this body of prelates was, by divine appointment, the successor of the Apostle St. Peter, who died in the city of Rome, and whose bishop thereby became his successor; in this successor was also vested the chief executive authority. When the great body of the prelates, with the adherence of the vast majority of their flocks, in union with that head of the visible church, declared that what they had received from their predecessors as the doctrine of God, agreed with what they found to be the testimony of all preceding ages, and that they also found it comformable to the sacred Scriptures, whose preservation and guardianship, both as to their matter and spirit, was committed to their predecessors and to themselves; the declaration was considered to be the solemn judgment of the church, from which there was no appeal, and was regarded as an infallibly correct exhibition of God's law, from which no person could lawfully dissent; since God had established this church to be their authorized teacher in his name, on his behalf, and guided in such decisions by his Holy Spirit. Thus, whether their belief was religiously correct or not, in fact all the people and governments of Europe looked upon such a testimony as giving to them unquestionable certainty of what was God's will respecting his service. If their position was correct, there would be no impropriety, when they were unanimous in this belief, in their vesting a power in the government to protect the church, and in making it part of the duty of the civil magistrate to prohibit the introduction of what all were certain must be error: and this not only because of its mere religious incorrectness, but

also because of the schisms, strifes, violence, and breaches of the peace which necessarily accompanied such innovations. It was in this manner, that when in Europe there was but one religion, the civil magistrate, with the consent of the people, assumed, retained, and exercised the power of being "a nursing father to the church;" and it is only in such a case he could properly assume or exercise such a power. Three conditions must coexist: the absence of either of which would render the assumption a nefarious usurpation; first, the government and the people must be so nearly unanimous on the subject of religion, as that there could scarcely be found any body of dissenters worth notice; secondly, it will not suffice that this vast majority have only a great or a superior probability, that theirs is that system of religion which God has established: they must have reasonable and sufficient grounds to remove doubt, and to create certainty; thirdly, the power which created the government must have, either directly or by acquiescence, vested the government with the authority of giving such protection.

I do not know a single European government, at the period of the great change of religion, and of separation from the Catholic Church in the fifteenth century, which had not upon the ground of the coexistence of these three conditions, been "nursing fathers" to the Roman Catholic Church. In some instances, they took good wages for their fostering care; in others, they enacted laws too cruel for Christian governments to execute; in very many instances, under the pretext of protecting the church, they indulged the spirit of rapine and revenge, and committed in the name of God deeds incompatible with his attributes. All these evils have been greatly exaggerated, falsehood has been added to the truth, and the church has been made accountable for all mischief done in her name, frequently against her will. I am far from denying that many of her prelates have been unworthy of the places which they held, and in the midst of such scenes have exhibited themselves fit associates for those amongst whom they lived; but, whilst religion weeps at the scandals caused, she laments the disingenuity of the historian who suppresses the record of the heroic virtue, the glorious spirit of patriotism and purity which distinguished vast numbers of her sons and daughters, as also the fervid and well-regulated piety and wisdom of a large portion of kings, emperors, and other governors, and their counsellors and officers, who, whilst they aided the cause of truth and of virtue, made more wide and solid the foundations of public liberty, civilization, literature, arts, manufactures, commerce, and social institutions.

When religious innovation was introduced, parties were created, strife ensued, persecution wielded her destructive implements, hatred,

contention, war, and rapine, desolated the fairest portions of the civilized world. Without examining the ground upon which the governments gradually assumed and exercised the power of being "nursing fathers" to the Church, Catholics and Protestants went back to the Jewish theocracy for precedent and authority, thus assuming to found their respective claims upon an analogy which never did and never could exist.

Upon the Protestant principle, the second of the conditions which I have stated as being requisite to sustain this nursing claim, never could exist: and therefore the idea of a Protestant government fostering a church, is an absurdity. Whenever the dissenters from the Catholic faith became numerous, though they should be only a feeble minority, the first condition ceased to exist; and if in addition to this, the public will should be dissatisfied at the continuance of this power in the government, that still strengthened the claim for its abandonment. The operation of these causes has in Europe produced, through a series of struggles and calamities, that revolution, which by gradual progress, has nearly severed the church from its connexion with the state.

But in America, at the period of our revolution, not one of those conditions existed, and the popular mind urged to the examination of first principles, in most instances recognised the maxims which I have endeavoured to develope; and in giving to our governments their powers, generally, not only did the people not bestow upon them this power of guardianship, or of being "nursing fathers," but in several instances directly prohibited its assumption. It is true, that in some of the States, the ancient bitterness and bigotry, united with the imagination of popish terrors, caused them to prohibit the elevation of Roman Catholics to certain places of honour or trust: but with only two melancholy and disgraceful exceptions, viz.: of North Carolina, and of New Jersey, this prohibition has been cancelled; and Maryland has also blotted from her constitution, the ridiculous and unbecoming exclusion from office, of the Jews. Thus the "nursing fathers" principle and all such like, are generally unknown to the spirit as to the letter of our state constitutions. Nor could it well be otherwise. The constitutions have been made for and by people of every variety of religion, who in many instances had experienced the evils of the last struggles of the church and state union or severance in Europe, and who determined to guard against their introduction here.

But in forming our federal government, it was distinctly regulated that it was not to exercise any power, save that which was specially granted to it by the people of the states. To exercise any other, would be palpable usurpation. The powers granted were exclusively political,

and the jealousy of the people, by a distinct and specific declaration, restrained the Congress from the exercise of the only power connected with religion, which it was supposed possible for them to assume. Thus, whether the governments in other places might or might not make religious regulations, the federal government is bound to confine itself strictly to the exercise of the powers with which it is vested; and they are purely political, to the exclusion of religious questions, whether general or special, directly or indirectly. The Congress has no power to nurse the Evangelist, nor to frown upon the Papist; it cannot prefer the Christian to the Jew; nor bestow one cent either to plant the Gospel in Monrovia, to build a synagogue at Grand Island, or a mosque in New York. I remain, my friends,

Yours, respectfully, B. C.

LETTER XI

Lord Pam in the church (could you think it?) kneel'd down:
Then, told that the duke was just come to town,
His station despising, unaw'd by the place,
He flies from his God, to attend on his grace.
To the court it was fitter to pay his devotion.
For God had no share in his lordship's promotion.

Epigram on an Irish Protestant Bishop.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 26, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—I have exhibited to you the facts and principles upon which it must be evident that our federal government is not warranted to intermeddle with the interests of religion, directly or indirectly. It is not commissioned to take any part whatever in religious concerns. I now proceed to show that the United States cannot with any degree of truth, be called a "Protestant country," in the meaning of the saints.

Protestantism, according to different authors, has different meanings. Chillingworth, an eminent English writer, calls Protestantism "the religion of the Bible." That is, every man who finds his religion in the Bible, is a Protestant. I need go no farther to show you the folly of this definition, not to notice its obscurity, than to state that, according thereto, Roman Catholics are Protestants, because they assert that their doctrines are found in the Bible, and are drawn therefrom. But suppose I admit the definition to be good. I venture to assert that a large proportion of our population does seriously hesitate as to believing the sacred volume to be the word of God, or a religious authority,

and do not draw their principles of religion from that source, but from what they call reason. The saints themselves inform us, that infidelity is widely spread through the country, and deplore as a serious evil to the republic, the number of infidels; so that if all who believed in the religion of the Bible, (and which of us could undertake upon Protestant principles to point out accurately, and certainly, what that is?) were to be deducted from our population, though we should retain a vast majority, yet we should suffer a serious diminution: and by our social compact, that minority is entitled to all the rights of citizenship, including the right of eligibility to office, and its enjoyment if elected. Not only is this the case in our general government, but it is the case in every one of our states, save North Carolina and New Jersey, which require the qualification of Protestantism for civil office.

Others define Protestantism to be "the religion of the Protestant Episcopal Church." Whatever may be the case in Great Britain, certainly this will not hold good in America. It is by others defined to be "the profession of Christianity with dissent from Popery." Thus the Greek, the Armenian, the Russian, the Nestorian, and the hundred other eastern sects would be Protestants. This is a classification as curious as it is absurd. It would exhibit to us the extraordinary fact of American Protestants sending missionaries to Asia, for the purpose of converting Protestants to Protestantism. We must give up this definition. Others tell us that Protestantism is "the adhering to Lutheran or Calvinistic churches, or to some one of the branches derived from them." Thus Arminians and strict Calvinists, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, Zuinglians who deny the real presence, and Lutherans who assert it, Trinitarians and Unitarians, Methodists who believe in the existence of hell, and Universalists who deny its existence: and a vast variety of other discordant divisions are all Protestants. But to be a Protestant it is necessary to be a member of some one of those divisions. Suppose, my friends, that I assume this to be the correct definition of Protestantism: is ours a Protestant country? Let us deduct the Roman Catholics and the infidels from the aggregate population; let us again deduct all those who, though they have some vague notion of revelation, and believe that indeed the Bible is the word of God, neither know why they think so, nor can they form any distinct notion of its doctrines; and say that they belong to no church, and as yet have their religion to choose; let us add this large mass of our population to the Catholics and infidels, and ask whether, because we call the remainder Protestants, this is "a Protestant country?" I ask you, which of the two divisions is more numerous? I shall not undertake to make a positive assertion, but I

apprehend that it is as likely that the majority is on what would be called the non-Protestant side. If such be the fact, this cannot with propriety be called a Protestant, a Catholic, or an Infidel country. It is properly, and strictly speaking, a country of no distinct religious denomination, but one of perfect freedom, and of a vast variety of religious opinions; one whose inhabitants have solemnly interdicted to its government any interference, direct or indirect, with the subject of their religion.

Did the saints acquiesce in this latter definition of Protestantism, I apprehend they would have no ground either for asserting that this was a Protestant country, or that there was a majority of the inhabitants who wished the government to act upon the subject of religion, to be "nursing fathers" to their common church. Where does it exist? But I am under the impression that our evangelical brethren will not admit Unitarians, Universalists, Socinians, or many other of the subdivisions which have branched forth from the stocks of Luther and Calvin, to be Protestants, correctly speaking; they generally assert that these divisions are heterodox; that they err in fundamentals; that they have departed from the faith once given to the saints; and I have found them, in most instances, to make the specific difference of Protestantism to consist in "the doctrine of justification by faith." I am under the impression that this is the grand distinctive character of orthodoxy. If so, we must take as the definition of Protestantism, "the belief of justification by faith in the Redeemer." This is the evangelical standard; and I go very far in their favour when I say, that perhaps one-sixth of the population, according to this definition, may be classed as Protestants. And if this be actually the case, upon what ground will they say that this is in their view, or in strict truth, a Protestant country?

Thus, I am under the impression that, however reluctantly, and with what bad grace it will be yielded, yet the confession must be made that this is not a Protestant country. Did Louisiana, Florida, Arkansas, and Missouri, upon their incorporation with the United States, not stipulate that they should continue to possess all their religious rights? Was not the stipulation acceded to? Were they not Catholic at the period of their incorporation? Have they become Protestant? Is there any distinction between their rights and those of Connecticut, Maine, or Pennsylvania, or the District of Columbia? Are the Protestants who have emigrated into those formerly Catholic colonies stripped therein of any right which a Catholic enjoys? Are not Protestant sheriffs, magistrates, legislators, judges, generals, governors, representatives, and senators in those places, in double, treble, and quadruple ratio of their

numbers, without any complaint, jealousy, or displeasure on the part of the Catholics? Are they not, in most instances, placed in those stations by Catholic votes? Why, then, shall not Catholics have similar rights in the former Protestant colonies, or are we to have different laws or principles of action under our common government, because of our religious diversities? Hitherto we have been content to permit our fellow-citizens of other religious denominations to take precedence of us in the actual enjoyment of the honours and the emoluments of office. We voluntarily abstained from the contest, and rested content with the fruits of our industry, without seeking either to feed at the public crib, or to be caparisoned with the public housings; we neither inquired what was the religion of the candidate, nor whether his eyes were black, or blue, or gray, or hazel. We were led to imagine that such inquiry would be not only foolish, but impertinent. It seems, however, that we were in error. This is a Protestant country, and it ought to have a Protestant government!!! No, my friends. It is not a Protestant country; the Catholic has here equal rights with the Protestants; and this assumption of the saints is a falsehood in fact, it is a legal untruth, a constitutional absurdity. If ninety-nine hundredths of the present population were to become Catholics to-morrow, they would be morally criminal did they exclude the remaining hundredth portion from any civil, or political, or religious right; and under our constitution the attempt would be usurpation, and therefore invalid. They might, it is true, enter into a combination to render the legal provisions which secure some of those rights to Protestants unavailing,—Catholics might permit the law to declare them eligible to office, whilst they combined not to elect them; and thus imitating the misconduct of the Irish corporations, the majority of whose members are confederated Orangemen, they might convert the expression of equality into that bitter irony which taunts you with mockery of that justice which their bigotry withholds. This, my friends, is the prudence of Irish evangelicals; this, I shall show you, is the charity of our saints! This indeed would be a violation of the spirit, though not of the letter of our constitution; this is the way in which miserable minorities of evangelical monopolists have in Ireland, during forty years, kept to themselves those places which the law declared to be equally open to the Catholics as to them. This is a vile swindling to which no body of men can stoop, until they shall have extinguished the last ray shed by heaven upon the conscience, exhausted the last tinge which modesty could spread upon the cheek, and become callous to every fine impulse of nature. Hitherto the generosity which would spurn such baseness had wide influence

through our land; and in several places the isolated individual who differed with his fellow-citizens might openly and honestly avow that difference without being made the victim to his candour. But the system of the saints is well calculated to substitute hypocrisy for this openness, to create distrust instead of confidence, and to enable smooth rogues to banish honest men from all places of trust, and honour, and emolument, in the public service.

If the spirit of the constitution would not permit the great body of Catholics, where they prodominate, to combine against the rights of the Protestants, neither does it permit the Protestants, where they form a majority, to combine against the Catholics; and that which is improper as a rule in any one of the parts of this Union, would be improper if assumed as a rule for the nation at large. If the people of Louisiana were to combine and send only Catholics to their Legislature, or to Congress; if they should exclude from all offices in the state every person who was not a member of their church, what a cry of bigotry, intolerance, persecution, and violated rights would be set up! And very properly! It would be of no avail that they should answer, that theirs was a Catholic State; that they destroyed no public right; that upon their books the eligibility of every man was recognised; that they allowed Protestants equally as Catholics to be candidates; that they punished no man who thought proper to vote for them, but that they merely exercised their own undoubted right of voting as they thought proper. All this might be very species, but the evil would be too palpable; and the obvious answer would be, that the combination and its object were equally against the spirit of the constitution: that we judged then not so much by what they had written, as by what they had done. The people of America would not permit this violation of public rights by Catholics. Will they permit a worse violation by the saints?

The Evangelicals complain, that "whilst the land had been stained with the blood of the victims of intemperance, many of our political watchmen, who ought to see that the republic receives no detriment, have been so intent on elections, that they have not appeared to know of this invasion." What invasion? They have made such statements as would lead one to suppose that we were the most intemperate people upon earth, and that our conduct was becoming worse; whereas, in fact, we are comparatively a temperate people, and yearly improving. This improvement had made great progress before their mania commenced; and their efforts, however injudicious upon principle, and mischievous in mistatements and exaggerations, have perhaps considerably

accelerated that improvement. But what would they have the political watchmen—that is, the members of the federal government—to do in this case? They complain that "the guardians of the republic sleep while millions are plundered from that people to prepare an offering of human blood for this insatiable Moloch." All this is unmeaning rant, except they can show us by what constitutional action the government can interfere. They have not spoken upon this point. They leave us to conjecture or deduction as to what the special mode of action should be; but they merely proclaim that government should act.

Again they tell us that "Popery is laying the foundations of an empire with which, if it prevail, the enlightened freedom of the republic cannot coexist," that "civil and religious liberty as understood in the last half century cannot coexist with the laws of the papel communion," "injuries are inflicted [upon the republic] by some hundreds of thousands of the subjects of Popery and intemperance." "The republic also receives detriment from infidels and the varying tribes of anti-Christians that inhabit the land," as also from "profane swearers," "gamblers," "Sabbath-breakers," and "votaries of dissipation." Suppose all this to be true! I ask by what constitutional process was the government to remove the evil? The saints tell us, that "the danger to the republic from men of this stamp has been increased by the fact that they fill some of its important places of trust." Of course they suggest that these men ought to be ejected.

We know that it is neither very religious nor very patriotic to be a railer against rulers of the people who are constitutionally in office, and who conduct themselves with as much decorum as is to be found in the best regulated governments of the civilized world. I shall not venture to assert that all our public officers are immaculate, nor that their private conduct can in every instance escape the censure of even the virtuous. They have not put themselves forward as paragons of perfection, nor were they selected for their religious gifts, but for their political qualifications; they did not undertake to guide us in the path to paradise, but to steer the vessel of the republic safe from the shoals and quicksands dangerous to liberty, and to procure for us a reasonable share of temporal blessings. This they have done: this they are doing. And so far from deserving the vile and unbecoming vituperation of the holy ones, the aggregate of our federal officers will stand an advantageous comparison with most other governments in existence. It is a melancholy instance of the misapplication of religious censure when the vial of the zealot's wrath is thus unsparingly poured out upon the heads of men, selected to fill arduous and honourable posts; because

though their general demeanour is correct, they do not exactly agree in religious notions with that self-sufficient prophet who assumes to be their judge!

But, again I ask, what would this man require to be done? He would purify the public offices! Of whom? He would banish the intemperate! Will he charge this vice upon our government? Is the wretched libeller who scribbles a few pages of a tour through our states, and publishes to Europe the degrading caricature which he has sketched of America, to be sustained in his slanders, by the testimony of our saints? Is it not enough that they invite the profligates of the old world to people our commercial metropolis, and thus engraft upon it that noxious excrescence which they affect to abhor? Is it not enough that they expose the virtuous female of that city to the rude gaze of every inquisitive debauchee; that they cause the blush of confusion to mantle the cheek of every woman who acknowledges that city as her home? Is it not enough that they have filled every manly heart with indignation, every sensible bosom with pain, whilst their Magdalen report flies on the wings of the wind through every quarter of the globe, blighting the fair fame of the chaste daughters of our land? And will they in addition to this, endeavour still farther to disgrace us by the inglorious defamation of those men, whom we ourselves have selected as the rulers of our country? Are these officers drunkards? Are they votaries of dissipation, whose example is pernicious to the community? Are they infidels? The president and four or five members of his late cabinet were worshippers, if not members in a Presbyterian church at Washington. Is the charge of gambling made upon them? What has provoked the men of God to denounce the government as they have done? "So many of them [anti-Christians, infidels, votaries of dissipation, and so forth] had by some means obtained such stations, [important places of trust in the government,] a year or two since, that no Christian could speak plainly of the dangers to which his country was exposed, without being charged with the crime of "mingling religion with politics! ! !" The late developments show, perhaps, the origin of this accusation; for they plainly exhibit the Rev. Doctor Ely and the Rev. Mr. Campbell, both Presbyterian ministers, seated in full conclave with the President and his cabinet, regulating the very subject of those dangers. Yea, verily some persons would insinuate even that the modern saints emulated the freedom of Nathan himself, when he spoke of David! Perchance on that occasion, zeal was not tempered with discretion; it might be, that there existed neither the cunning of the serpent nor the simplicity of the dove in the venerable calculator upon the future

glories of ballot-boxes, either when the ladies and gentlemen of the cabinet waited upon him at Philadelphia, or when like another Paul, in presence of another Festus, he pleaded his cause before the President, in Washington. And it is possible that his visions of present domination were dissipated by the talismanic warning, not to mingle religion with politics. When what we deem solid glories thus quickly vanish into thin air, it is natural that we should be mortified; he who grasps at what he deems a sceptre, is more that disappointed when he has clutched, and clutched, and yet finds his hand empty. The avowal of the saints then is, that they think it necessary that Christians should have the opportunity of speaking of the dangers to which the republic is exposed by Papists and infidels, and anti-Christians, without being charged with the crime of mingling religion with politics! But surely they have that opportunity; neither are they sparing of its use. It is the theme of their declamation by day, and we may naturally suppose of their dreams by night. See the distorted countenance,—mark the dark eye-ball gleaming its hidden fire,—hear how he thunders from the desk,—the spirit is upon him, and he is voluble in his denunciation. The broad Mississippi rolls majestically along, and its valley spreads to his view; how he describes the abominations of the man of sin! Some monster has appalled him,—he is bewildered—he describes it as a beast of prey ravaging the land.—And yet this beast brings chains and fetters to rivet upon the people! ! ! Alas! what has caused this disorder of the imagination? Yet is he permitted to rave, and he complains of cruel, of impious, of sacrilegious restraint! ! ! The compositor is active, the corrector is vigilant, the pressman labours, the press itself groans. Steam is applied to add to its powers. The young and the old,—the demure and wrinkled dame, round whose lips not even Momus could produce the approximation to a smile goes forth, together with the maiden in whom beauty and innocence appear blended and personified, to distribute the productions of this exertion: stages bear them through the country, the churches expect them, the prayer meetings desire them, the revivals are anxious to experience their blessed consolations; the city and the field, the ship and the steamboat, the barrack and the brothel are all put in possession of the catalogue of abominations in every variety of shape, size, sermon, story, statement, and supply. From all those various sources the dollars and the cents are also collected to replenish the coffers of the powerful directors of this grand and extensive system. Yet is the nation solemnly assured that no Christian can speak plainly of the dangers to which

the country is exposed! ! ! What do these men desire? Listen to their own complaint.

"They (anti-Christians in power) seemed to regard the wise provisions of the constitution to prevent the establishment of religion by law, as an ordinance to consign the world of politics to the dominion of infidelity." No! good evangelicals, but they very properly looked upon it as an ordinance to exclude your dictation. The dominion of the world of politics was left equally open to the saint and the sinner: you had more than your share: but that would not content you. "They seemed to think that they had an exclusive right to reign in the political world." And pray good saints! did these infidels and anti-Christians deny the right of any officer who belonged to your body, on that account to discharge the duties of his office? Was Senator Frelinghuysen, or Senator Grundy, or President Jackson denied the right of regulating his portion of the government, because he frequented one of the evangelical churches, or sighed for the millennium, or preached, or declaimed, or contributed to your efforts to drive Popery from the Valley? No; you dare not make even this insinuation. Of what then do you complain? "When good men spoke or acted with reference to existing evils," "they were charged with intermeddling with politics," as if they had no interest in transmitting our republican institutions unimpaired to their children." All this is unmeaning. Let us come to some distinct proposition. Of what do you complain? What are the existing evils, against which you spoke? "An outcry was raised against the Rev. Dr. Ely, for sentiments which he published relative to the importance of electing men of good principles, who could be trusted, for civil rulers." So we have it out at last. The evangelicals wished to remedy the existing evils, by commencing on the plan of Rev. Doctor Ely, whose "sentiments no man but an infidel need blush to avow," that none except men of good, that is evangelical principles, ought to be trusted in civil offices, that the Papists, such as Mr. Taney, about whom so much noise has been made, and the intemperate, the dissipated, the Sabbath-breakers, and the gamblers, should be excluded from office. This is then the whole burden of the canting chorus, that the men of God ought to have power to exclude from office those who are not saints —and we are threatened with lamentation and wailing and wo, because the government has not violated its obligation, by associating as their directors the grand evangelical inquisitors into office. We must my friends, resume this subject.

Yours respectfully,

B. C.

LETTER XII

She syttes upon a rocke,
She bendes before hys speer,
She ryses from the shocks,
Wielding her own yn ayre.

Chatterton.

CHARLESTON, S. C. Oct. 3, 1831.

To the Candid and Unprejudiced People of America.

My Friends:—I am desirous of closing this series of letters. I have trespassed upon your patience and been tedious in exhibiting evidence to prove that of which most of you have been long since convinced, viz., that the evangelicals complained that under the pretext of placing men of good principles in civil office, they were not permitted to exclude from all places of public honour, public trust, and public emolument, all men who did not belong to their party. Thus they sought to monopolize the stations of government to the exclusion of infidels, of Papists, and of the ungodly and the heterodox. That is they aim at a practical violation of the constitution of the United States. The rabid fury with which they assail Roman Catholics is abundant evidence of their disposition. The moment any member of that church is chosen to any office worth naming, that instant he and his church are villainously outraged: laboured and polished essays, and vile and vulgar contumely are flung abroad amongst the public, and you are called upon to protect your endangered liberties. These productions are seen in Europe, they are noticed in Catholic nations, and our country is viewed by men of literature and of acquirements in no very flattering way. Yet, what care the evangelicals for this? Their object is to perpetuate ancient prejudices for their private emolument: and if they succeed, the public may indeed hiss them, but they will applaud themselves. Hence they are reckless of the character of the nation, provided they possess the influence of power, or are able to count a large share of dollars in their stock.

Hitherto they have been defeated in their efforts, and they on that account complain of the men in power. The Congress refused to declare that this was a country of any religious denomination, or to assume any power of religious legislation, upon the express plea that they received no such commission. Hence they are to be considered infidels. They declined the honour of being "nursing fathers of the church," upon the principle that they were only appointed to be political representatives of the states and of the people. For this they are

denominated anti-Christians. By means of petitions, of suggestions, of disquisitions, and various modes of influence, efforts were made to procure the enactment of a law upon the basis, that the public business should be regulated upon the principle of observing one divine law, as interpreted by one portion of the people,—and that portion the evangelical. Should that basis be laid, it would be sufficiently ample to sustain any edifice they might think proper to erect; for if the divine law as interpreted by this division were to be made the rule of legislation in one case, why not in another? Let one precedent be given, and the question would not be, what enactments it would sanction, but to what it would not extend. The Congress refused to be influenced, and therefore we find it charged with "Sabbath-breaking," and its members with licentiousness. Thus, because the constitution is not violated, it is said that religion is destroyed. The principle for which Protetantism affected to contend is, that no man should have dominion over the conscience of another, but that every man should be the interpreter of God's law in his own behalf, and that no man should presume to force his interpretation upon another. Yet the practice of those self-styled Protestants is, to endeavour to compel others to submit to their interpretation. If the Congress desires to transport the mail, it compels no one to be the carrier. The conditions are known to all, and he who feels them interfere with his notions of religion is not forced to carry it. In like manner no one is compelled to drink whiskey; the distiller may make it if he will; and the grocer may sell it; but no one is compelled to buy or to drink it. What would our evangelicals say, if Congress were to enact that no butcher should sell meat to a Catholic on Friday or Saturday, and that if any tavern-keeper furnished it to him he should forfeit his license and be fined? Yet the principle is the same. Congress has no power to compel the evangelical member to observe one law according to the interpretation of his sect, nor to compel a Catholic to observe another according to the discipline and interpretation of his spiritual authority. Our government therefore very properly declined to interfere:—and it has thus called forth the vituperation of the saints. But though baffled, they will not desist.

What is now their plan? You see it is in operation. In our country everything is carried by the ballot-box. The holy ones saw that although they are at present a minority: yet by perseverance they might become a majority. Dr. Ely in the exultation of his heart proclaimed the mode by which it was to be effected. His brethren denied in a variety of ways that their object was what the Doctor developed: yet no one was deceived. The editor of the *Telegraph* now avows that the

public understood the Doctor correctly, and that no one except an infidel need be ashamed to avow as the Doctor did, that by means of Sabbath schools, the rising generation might be so trained up as that in a few years, by concerted action at the ballot-boxes, none but men of good principles, that is men of the evangelical school, should hold public offices. And is there any question of this being not only a feasible plan, but one in which, if the saints can train up the children to their purposes, they must necessarily succeed?

From the remarks which I have previously made, it is clear that the framers of the constitution neither intended nor felt themselves authorized to make ours a sectarian government: and yet, if the saints succeed in their plan, will it not become, to all intents and purposes, sectarian? No; we are told this is impossible, for though there is a concert between those who hold evangelical principles, yet these persons are so divided into sects, that no one of the five or six which compose their aggregate could acquire an ascendency over the others, and in their minor differences we have the guarantee of our liberty; should any one of them arrogate to itself any predominance, the others would unite against the ambitious division, and defeat its unholy purposes. Suppose, my friends, that such would be the case; I ask, why should the aggregate of those sects be permitted to exclude the great body of their fellow-citizens, whom those elect designate as Papists, intemperate, anti-Christian, dissolute, infidel, gamblers, and Sabbath-breakers? Are not these men American citizens? And why are they to be disfranchised? Is it a crime for them to avail themselves of the Protestant principle, that each individual is to regulate his own religious conduct and belief without being accountable to his fellow-citizens, or liable to any civil or political disability, for his exercise of this right? But we are told that these systems lead, necessarily, to demoralization and to the ruin of our liberties: and that the lovers of liberty and good order should, therefore, discountenance them. The assumption is only an opinion which might be erroneous; and which I believe and know to be so in fact. I am of opinion that the principle of justification by faith, which I take to be characteristic of Evangelical Protestantism, is, if carried into practice, more demoralizing and destructive to our freedom, public and personal, than even infidelity. The evangelical Protestant will proclaim this to be a grievous mistake, and would deprecate as tyranny my being permitted to exclude him from office because of my opinion. He would in this be sustained by the spirit of our institutions, by the principles of our constitution, and by the patriotism of the republic. Shall I not, then, be equally sustained by the same powers in my ob-

jection to his being permitted to exclude me, a Roman Catholic, and my fellow-citizens, who, though Christians, are neither Evangelicals, nor Papists. Shall he be permitted to exclude the Jew, the anti-Christian, the Deist? Would he not have excluded Charles Caroll and Thomas Jefferson?

But he tells us, that he leaves us all in possession of our eligibility, and even of our right of voting, and he asks whether we are warranted to tell him and his associates that they shall be debarred from their right of voting for those men, whose religious principles and moral conduct they approve. I must, indeed, upon the general principle, concede all that he claims. But what would you say to the Catholics of those sections where they predominate, were they to treat Protestants in this way? What would the holy men themselves say, if that to which their conduct and efforts would naturally urge the public were reduced to practice, and that whilst they are a minority, all those against whom they have conspired were to enter into a league of co-operation, and to exclude from office every member of an evangelical church or society? The saints have conspired to act upon this principle against the body of the people; upon what ground could they then complain, if their own principle were turned against themselves? The consequence would indeed be unpleasant. We should have religious rancour superadded to our political differences. But will not this consequence arise whether the principle be acted upon by the saints or by the sinners? There is no way of avoiding it but by abandoning the principle itself; it is one at open variance with all our republican institutions.

Thus, even though the variety of their sect should appear to give you security against the usurpation and predominance of any one of the subdivisions of which this Christian party in politics is composed; yet their combination promises to elevate the party upon the ruins of your rights; and to produce consequences of the most disastrous character to the country itself.

When it is said that the variety of sects precludes the possibility of usurpation, I am led to consult my experience rather than my imagination. I know many villages, especially in our Southern States, in which, at their origin, the inhabitants were of various Protestant sects, and I may, indeed, say, generally evangelical. Neither the numbers nor the means of the sects warranted the erection of separate churches, and the maintenance of different settled pastors; they united their efforts to build a common church, in which the pastors of all would have equal rights. They went on harmoniously for a time, and each pastor, as he visited, was welcomed to the church; but year after year began to give a

greater singleness of character to the trustees; though the church was open to divers preachers, yet he was taught in accord with the great body of the trustees, always had a preference, and occasionally a stipend. His services were more frequent; he then became a resident; and he appeared statedly in the pulpit: the others, upon their arrival, generally found it thus preoccupied. They could now seldom find an opportunity of holding forth, save on some week-day, and not always then. Disgusted, disappointed, and uniformly out-voted, the few dissident trustees resigned. There was on the side of their co-trustees an affectation of regret. Why could not brethren live together in harmony, as from the beginning? The board of trustees was now filled up, and they were, for the first time, all members in accord with the preacher. They who had departed were consoled; they were encouraged to do something for themselves; perhaps fifty or a hundred dollars, together with the promise of a subscription to aid them, was taken as a full compensation for the church which originally belonged to a community of five or six sects, but which now had become the property of one, and that one not always the most numerous, of the first owners. I could reckon up several churches whose history is here described, and almost in every instance they have fallen into the hands of one sect, and that the one which has most frequently put forward the fact of the diversity of sects in the evangelical combination as the guarantee for the safety of equal rights, and equal powers . . . . I need not make the application. You, my friends and fellow-citizens, have intellect equally strong as he who addresses you, and your conclusion is his. Thus, even if the monopolizing aggregate of five or six sects was to continue with a balance of power between the parties, still would their act be palpable and vile aggression upon the rights of their fellow-citizens; and their present variety of sects is no guarantee against the future predominance of the most industrious, the most insinuating, the most ambitious, and the most hypocritical.

Let us now see the manner in which the principle of Dr. Ely is to be reduced to practice. The principle is, that by training up the children in Sabbath-schools, such an influence can be created upon their minds as will necessarily operate at the ballot-boxes. They are not to be trained up to any special modification of federalism or democracy, but they are to be a Christian party in politics. Their teachers are to be Christians; the lessons, the expositions, the whole system of instruction is to be under the guidance of a board of saints. The only principle upon which the voters, as they grow up, are to be united is uniformly to support Christians, and to oppose profane and ungodly can-

didates. The Christian is not a Papist, is not an infidel, is not an anti-Christian—any man against whom there exists the suspicion of being suspected of anything condemned by the saints, is one of the ungodly. The board of local directors, and that of general directors, can easily testify for or against the Christianity of candidates. But who are to sustain their nominations? The candidate has necessarily some private and some political friends; then add to these the whole host of the children trained up at Sabbath-schools, now become men capable of voting, you see the Christian party in politics. But observe how industriously the agents are engaged. Thirty-eight thousand dollars have been expended last year, in exploring the valley of the Mississippi, merely preparatory to the introduction of their system. One of their collectors told a respectable gentleman in Georgia, who hesitated to subscribe, that the true object was to destroy the power of Popery in the great regions of the West, so as to deprive it of any political influence. Already in successful operation in various other quarters, the grand directors of the scheme saw that the West was not sufficiently organized; taking advantage of the religious feeling of the community, when they found themselves foiled in their premature efforts to seize upon the capital, they are so far from abandoning their plans that they have only retired to render them more effectual, and now, under the pretext of religion, they organize an extensive politico-religious association. And they are likely to succeed to the extent of their wishes; at least they have every reasonable prospect of success.

One word more before we part. The political press has not as yet been fully enlisted in their cause, and of this they piteously complain. Yet already they have in the various sections of the Union, a vast number of their own presses. And the great bulk of the political press is favourable to their Sunday-school schemes, their Bible schemes, their missionary schemes, their colonization schemes, their temperance schemes, and their emancipation and education schemes—which are all the various branches of the great Christian party in politics, and yet that press is accused, as "it is well known that too many of the conductors of the political press, instead of informing the people as watchmen ought, of the dangers which threaten the republic, are wholly engaged in promoting the supposed interests of their favourite candidate;" and they add, "It would not be difficult to show by facts, that the evils of this course are incalcuable." The object of this party is to procure the election of "men of good principles"—and yet the political press is accused of deserting its post by advocating the election of favourite candidates. How shall we understand this? There is but one explanation. The

political press has not yet taken its lessons respecting candidates from the Christian party in politics.—When it shall have done this, it will have performed its duty.

My friends, I have done with this writer. I am an enemy to intemperance, but I am also an enemy to pharisaical restraint. I am a friend to the bringing children together for religious instruction on the Sunday; but I am an enemy to organizing them into political factions to promote ambition under the guise of piety. I am a friend to the liberal and pious education of a respectable ministry, and to their being sent to cultivate the desert places of our land; but I am an enemy to training up youth in ferocious hatred to a portion of their fellow-citizens, whose tenets they are taught to misrepresent; and thus unfitted for the work of peace, are sent to brandish swords of devastation, and to apply the torches of incendiaries. I am a friend to the diffusion of the Gospel; but an enemy to vilifying of those who preserved it through the vicissitudes of ages, of revolutions, of barbarism, of philosophy, of infidelity, of crime, and of corruption. I am an ardent admirer, a devoted enthusiast, and a sworn friend to the liberties and the constitutions of our American confederation; and therefore I am irreconcilably inimical to every effort whether of fraud or of folly to violate their principles by disfranchising any portion of our citizens under the pretext of their religious mistakes.

I have exhibited to you the malignity and rancour which pervade the article that called me forth. I have shown you how it exhibits the settled design of degrading and disfranchising, not only the Roman Catholics of these United States, but also a vast multitude of their fellow-citizens. I have shown you that the Christian party in politics, not only has not ceased to exist, but is strong, active, compact, powerful, extensive, industrious, prudent, wealthy, and ambitious. The means which it has selected, have been judiciously chosen, and are likely to insure its predominance. It calls upon the people not only to tax themselves for its support, but also to pray for its success; and like its precursor in England, it is careful whilst they pray, to take such steps as will conduce to the efficacy of the appeal. Whilst Aaron and Hur sustain the hands of Moses upon the mountain, the sword of Josue smites powerfully upon the plain. It is for you to say whether our civil and religious rights are to share the fate of Amelec.

Yours, respectfully, B. C.

I would add to my letters the following as not only corroborating the positions which I have laid down, respecting the principle upon

which the saints act, but as indicating that principle already in extensive practical operation. The correctness or incorrectness of the special impressions here described does not influence the result which I exhibit. That result is, that in consequence of the general impressian created by the demeanour of the evangelical party, Catholics are frequently put under the ban of public opinion, and suffer that mortification of their feelings which is one of the most galling ingredients of persecution.

Bishop England has frequently mentioned instances of apologies for not visiting him, or omitting to pay him some mark of attention, having been conveyed to him through a common friend, in very many places of the two Carolinas and Georgia, on several occasions, from respectable, and liberal, and high-minded men, who were candidates for public office, or for public honours: with the explanation that the spirit of evangelical sectarianism was so virulent, and the influence of its preachers so powerful, that if the candidate called upon him as a friend, visited him as a gentleman, or paid him any attention as a stranger; he would run the greatest risk of losing his election. And the bishop is so well convinced of the common sense and correctness of principle upon which those explanations have been given, that, although he says very few citizens have so much reason as he has to be grateful for the public attention and private kindness of his separated brethren, he looks upon it as a matter of course that in those places where there is much of the evangelical feeling, he will not meet the candidate for public favour.

To this, I shall add the following testimony from a pamphlet lately published by Mr. Buchan of Rochester, N. Y. Indeed I might add fifty other authorities if necessary. B. C.

"But even if I had attacked those Presbyterians, entertaining the same opinions as their pastor, I would have been perfectly justified, for they not only bitterly attack all Catholics, but insist upon depriving them of their civil rights and liberty. And, in this spirit, they have exercised their undue influence over the publishers of the *Rochester Daily Advertiser.*

"There is no saying to what extent these sectarian and bigoted feelings thus displayed may be carried, when they are thus approved of and incited by one of their head pastors here. From the meeting-house they will extend to all the transactions of life. Nay, I solemnly believe, that if a Catholic were tried before a jury of such Presbyterians in this village, at the suit of a Presbyterian, justice would not be rendered to him. And no one, indeed, denies that these Presbyterians

here would not vote for a Catholic candidate for a seat in the legislature, or for any public office. They would not only not vote for him, but would exert all their influence to prevent his being returned, and that purely on the score of his religion. And if this is not persecution against the Catholics for their religious opinions, what is it? It is not, indeed, persecution by law, for that luckily is now taken out of the power of these religious fanatics, but in effect it is the same thing. And yet these people pretend to be Christians! But they say, 'Your religion is dangerous to our liberties.' Can any be so silly as to believe this? If they do, we have only to refer them to history, to satisfy them that they are wrong.—Were they not Catholics who extorted from King John of England, Magna Charta, the basis of British liberty? Was not trial by jury, which has been styled the palladium of liberty, instituted by Catholics? Is it not, in fact, to Catholics that we owe our whole system of jurisprudence? Have not Catholics, instead of showing themselves adverse to liberty, been always foremost in her ranks? Were not our armies filled with Catholics at the time of our glorious Revolution? In our struggle for liberty at that time, were we not assisted by Catholic France? Is not Charles Carroll, the last survivor of those noble patriots who signed the Declaration of our Independence, a Catholic? Are they not Catholics who are attempting to regenerate Ireland, and free her from her inglorious thraldom? and are they not Protestants who have been, and are still attempting to enslave her? While the Protestants of New England hanged and persecuted Quakers and other sectarians, were not the Catholics of Maryland the first to grant religious tolerance and freedom to every man to worship God in his own way? Was it not by Catholics that the late glorious revolution in Frence was accomplished? Are they there priest-ridden? Are they in 'a state of moral and intellectual degradation,' as 'Republicus' says? It surely cannot be said that they are in the vicinity of Protestants, and that that accounts for their free and liberal principles? And yet the editor of the *Observer* maintains that they are never good citizens, unless they are surrounded by and mix with Protestants. No doubt religion may be made a tool of by unprincipled men, under any bad government, but undoubtedly it cannot under a free government. Those who entertain the same notions as are promulgated in the *Rochester Observer,* are the very persons to make a tool of religion, and unite church to state, as is strongly exemplified in the conduct of those persons here, already alluded to."

BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
237.032E56
C001 V004
THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENG
3 2811 00007 6390